

Quasi-thin weakly distance-regular digraphs

Yuefeng Yang, Benjian Lv, Kaishun Wang*

Sch. Math. Sci. & Lab. Math. Com. Sys., Beijing Normal University, Beijing, 100875, China

Abstract

A weakly distance-regular digraph is quasi-thin if the maximum value of its intersection numbers is 2. In this paper, we focus on commutative quasi-thin weakly distance-regular digraphs, and classify such digraphs with valency more than 3. As a result, this family of digraphs are completely determined.

AMS classification: 05E30

Key words: Weakly distance-regular digraph; quasi-thin; Cayley digraph

1 Introduction

Throughout this paper Γ always denotes a finite simple digraph. We write $V\Gamma$ and $A\Gamma$ for the vertex set and arc set of Γ , respectively. A *path* of length r from x to y is a sequence of vertices $(x = w_0, w_1, \dots, w_r = y)$ such that $(w_{t-1}, w_t) \in A\Gamma$ for $t = 1, 2, \dots, r$. A digraph is said to be *strongly connected* if, for any two vertices x and y , there is a path from x to y . The length of a shortest path from x to y is called the *distance* from x to y in Γ , denoted by $\partial_\Gamma(x, y)$. Let $\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma(x, y) = (\partial_\Gamma(x, y), \partial_\Gamma(y, x))$ and $\tilde{\partial}(\Gamma) = \{\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma(x, y) \mid x, y \in V\Gamma\}$. We call $\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma(x, y)$ the *two way distance* from x to y in Γ . If no confusion occurs, we write $\partial(x, y)$ (resp. $\tilde{\partial}(x, y)$) instead of $\partial_\Gamma(x, y)$ (resp. $\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma(x, y)$). An arc (u, v) of Γ is of *type* $(1, r)$ if $\partial(v, u) = r$. A path $(w_0, w_1, \dots, w_{r-1})$ is said to be a *circuit* of length r if $\partial(w_{r-1}, w_0) = 1$. A circuit of length r is *undirected* if each of its arcs is of type $(1, 1)$, denoted by C_r .

A strongly connected digraph Γ is said to be *weakly distance-regular* if, for all $\tilde{h}, \tilde{i}, \tilde{j} \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)$ and $\tilde{\partial}(x, y) = \tilde{h}$

$$p_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}^{\tilde{h}}(x, y) := |\{z \in V\Gamma \mid \tilde{\partial}(x, z) = \tilde{i} \text{ and } \tilde{\partial}(z, y) = \tilde{j}\}|$$

depends only on $\tilde{h}, \tilde{i}, \tilde{j}$. The integers $p_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}^{\tilde{h}}$ are called the *intersection numbers*. We say that Γ is *commutative* if $p_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}^{\tilde{h}} = p_{\tilde{j}, \tilde{i}}^{\tilde{h}}$ for all $\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}, \tilde{h} \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)$. A weakly distance-regular digraph is *quasi-thin* (resp. *thin*) if the maximum value of its intersection numbers is 2 (resp. 1).

*Corresponding author.

E-mail address: yangyf@mail.bnu.edu.cn(Y.Yang), bjlv@bnu.edu.cn(B.Lv), wangks@bnu.edu.cn(K.Wang).

Some special families of weakly distance-regular digraphs were classified, such as [8, 7] for valency 2, [9, 10, 11] for valency 3 and [7] for thin case. In this paper, we classify commutative quasi-thin weakly distance-regular digraphs of valency more than 3, and obtain the following result.

Theorem 1.1 *If Γ is a commutative quasi-thin weakly distance-regular digraph of valency more than 3, then Γ is isomorphic to one of the following Cayley digraphs:*

- (i) $\text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_8, \{1, 2, 3, 6\})$.
- (ii) $\text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_{4p}, \{1, 2, 2p + i, 2p + 1, 2p + 2\})$, $p \neq 2 - i$.
- (iii) $\text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_4 \times \mathbb{Z}_4, \{(0, 1), (1, 0), (2, 0), (0, 2)\})$.
- (iv) $\text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_q \times \mathbb{Z}_4, \{(0, 1), (1, 0), (1, 2), (0, 2 + i)\})$, $q \neq 3 + i$.
- (v) $\text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_{2q} \times \mathbb{Z}_2, \{(0, 1), (1, 0), (2, 0), (1, 1)\})$.
- (vi) $\text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_{4q} \times \mathbb{Z}_2, \{(0, 1), (1, 0), (2, 0), (2q + 1, 0), (2q + 2, 0), (2qi, 1)\})$, $q \notin \{3, 3 + i\}$.
- (vii) $\text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_{2q} \times \mathbb{Z}_4, \{(0, 1), (1, 0), (1, 2), (0, 2 - i), (2, 0), (2, 2)\})$, $q \notin \{3, 3 + i\}$.
- (viii) $\text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_{2q} \times \mathbb{Z}_n, \{(0, 1), (1, 0), (2, 0), (0, -1)\})$.
- (ix) $\text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_{2q} \times \mathbb{Z}_n, \{(0, 1), (1, (c + 1)/2), (1, (c - 1)/2), (2, c), (0, -1)\})$.
- (x) $\text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_{2n} \times \mathbb{Z}_q, \{(0, 1), (1, (t + 1)/2), (-1, (1 - t)/2), (2, t), (-2, -t)\})$.

Here, $i \in \{0, 1\}$, $2 \leq p$, $3 \leq q$, $3 \leq n \leq q - (1 + (-1)^q)/2$, $c = n/\gcd(q, n)$, $t = q/\gcd(q, n)$ and c, t are both odd.

Routinely, all digraphs in above theorem are commutative quasi-thin weakly distance-regular. For the last seven families of Cayley digraphs, in Table 1, we list the two way distance from the identity element to any other element of the corresponding group.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce some preliminary results for weakly distance-regular digraphs. In the remaining sections, we focus on commutative quasi-thin weakly distance-regular digraphs. In Section 3, we introduce the concepts of pure arcs and mixed arcs, and give a characterization of mixed arcs. In Section 4, we describe a useful configuration, and discuss its properties. In Section 5, we prepare a property about the relation among the types of arcs. In Section 6, we discuss the existence of some special subdigraphs. In Section 7, we prove our main theorem.

2 Preliminary results

In this section, we shall introduce some basic results which are used frequently in this paper.

Let Γ be a commutative weakly distance-regular digraph and $R = \{\Gamma_{\tilde{i}} \mid \tilde{i} \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)\}$, where $\Gamma_{\tilde{i}} = \{(x, y) \in V\Gamma \times V\Gamma \mid \tilde{\partial}(x, y) = \tilde{i}\}$. Then $(V\Gamma, R)$ is a commutative association scheme ([2, 12]). Moreover, if Γ is quasi-thin, then $(V\Gamma, R)$ is quasi-thin. About this special schemes, see [4, 5, 6].

For two nonempty subsets E and F of R , define

$$EF := \{\Gamma_{\tilde{h}} \mid \sum_{\Gamma_{\tilde{i}} \in E} \sum_{\Gamma_{\tilde{j}} \in F} p_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}^{\tilde{h}} \neq 0\},$$

$$\langle F \rangle := \cap \{E \subseteq R \mid F \subseteq E \text{ and } EE \subseteq E\},$$

and write $\Gamma_{\tilde{i}}\Gamma_{\tilde{j}}$ and $\langle \Gamma_{1,q-1} \rangle$ instead of $\{\Gamma_{\tilde{i}}\}\{\Gamma_{\tilde{j}}\}$ and $\langle \{\Gamma_{1,q-1}\} \rangle$, respectively. The size of $\Gamma_{\tilde{i}}(x) := \{y \in V\Gamma \mid \tilde{\partial}(x, y) = \tilde{i}\}$ depends only on $\tilde{i}$, denoted by $k_{\tilde{i}}$. For any $(a, b) \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)$, we usually write $k_{a,b}$ (resp. $\Gamma_{a,b}$) instead of $k_{(a,b)}$ (resp. $\Gamma_{(a,b)}$). For $\tilde{i}, \tilde{j} \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)$ and $x, y \in V\Gamma$, we set $P_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}(x, y) := \Gamma_{\tilde{i}}(x) \cap \Gamma_{\tilde{j}}^*(y)$.

Lemma 2.1 ([2, Chapter II, Proposition 2.2] and [1, Proposition 5.1]) *For each $\tilde{i} := (a, b) \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)$, define $\tilde{i}^* = (b, a)$. The following hold:*

- (i) $k_{\tilde{d}}k_{\tilde{e}} = \sum_{\tilde{f} \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)} p_{\tilde{d}, \tilde{e}}^{\tilde{f}} k_{\tilde{f}}$.
- (ii) $p_{\tilde{d}, \tilde{e}}^{\tilde{f}} k_{\tilde{f}} = p_{\tilde{f}, \tilde{e}^*}^{\tilde{d}} k_{\tilde{d}} = p_{\tilde{d}^*, \tilde{f}}^{\tilde{e}} k_{\tilde{e}}$.
- (iii) $|\Gamma_{\tilde{d}}\Gamma_{\tilde{e}}| \leq \gcd(k_{\tilde{d}}, k_{\tilde{e}})$.
- (iv) $\sum_{\tilde{e} \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)} p_{\tilde{d}, \tilde{e}}^{\tilde{f}} = k_{\tilde{d}}$.
- (v) $\text{lcm}(k_{\tilde{d}}, k_{\tilde{e}}) \mid p_{\tilde{d}, \tilde{e}}^{\tilde{f}} k_{\tilde{f}}$.
- (vi) $\sum_{\tilde{f} \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)} p_{\tilde{d}, \tilde{e}}^{\tilde{f}} p_{\tilde{g}, \tilde{f}}^{\tilde{h}} = \sum_{\tilde{l} \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)} p_{\tilde{g}, \tilde{d}}^{\tilde{l}} p_{\tilde{l}, \tilde{e}}^{\tilde{h}}$.

Lemma 2.2 *Let $k_{\tilde{d}} = 2$. Then there exists $\tilde{e}$ such that $p_{\tilde{d}, \tilde{d}}^{\tilde{e}} = 2$. If x, y, z are three vertices such that $(x, y), (z, y) \in \Gamma_{\tilde{d}}$, then $\partial(x, z) = \partial(z, x)$.*

Proof. By the commutativity of Γ , the first statement holds. The second statement follows from Lemma 2.1 (iii). $\square$

The commutativity of Γ will be used frequently in the sequel, so we no longer refer to it for the sake of simplicity.

Lemma 2.3 *If $(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$ is an undirected circuit in Γ , then $\partial(x_0, x_i) = \partial(x_i, x_0) = \partial(x_0, x_{n-i})$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$.*

Proof. It is routine by induction. $\square$

3 Pure arcs and mixed arcs

In this section, we introduce pure arcs and mixed arcs, and discuss their properties. As an application of these results, we give a characterization of mixed arcs.

Let Γ be a commutative weakly distance-regular digraph. An arc of type $(1, q-1)$ is said to be *pure*, if every circuit of length q containing it consists of arcs of type $(1, q-1)$; otherwise, this arc is said to be *mixed*. We call $(1, q-1)$ is pure if any arc of type $(1, q-1)$ is pure; otherwise, we call $(1, q-1)$ is mixed.

Let F be a subset of R and $x \in V\Gamma$. Set $F(x) := \{y \in V\Gamma \mid (x, y) \in \cup_{f \in F} f\}$, and $F_{q_1, q_2, \dots, q_l}(x)$ is a collection of vertices y satisfying there exists a path from x to y such that each arc in that path is of type $(1, q_1 - 1), (1, q_2 - 1), \dots, (1, q_{l-1} - 1)$ or $(1, q_l - 1)$. Suppose that $\Delta_{q_1, \dots, q_l}(x)$ is the digraph with the vertex set $F_{q_1, \dots, q_l}(x)$ such that (y, z) is an arc if $(y, z) \in \Gamma_{1, q_i - 1}$ for some i . In Γ , $\Delta_{q_1, q_2, \dots, q_l}(x)$ does not depend on the choice of vertex x up to isomorphism. If no confusion occurs, we write $\Delta_{q_1, \dots, q_l}$ instead of $\Delta_{q_1, \dots, q_l}(x)$.

Lemma 3.1 *If $(1, 3)$ is pure and $k_{1,1} = 2$, then $\Delta_2 \simeq C_3$.*

Proof. Since $(1, 3)$ is pure, we have $p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(2,2)} \neq 0$. Let x, y, z be three vertices such that $\tilde{\partial}(x, y) = \tilde{\partial}(y, z) = (1, 1)$. By Lemma 2.3, we have $\tilde{\partial}(x, z) = (1, 1)$ or $(2, 2)$. If $\tilde{\partial}(x, z) = (2, 2)$, then there exists a vertex $y' \in P_{(1,3),(1,3)}(z, x)$, which implies that (x, y, z, y') is a circuit containing arcs of types $(1, 1)$ and $(1, 3)$, a contradiction. Hence, $\tilde{\partial}(x, z) = (1, 1)$, as desired. $\square$

Lemma 3.2 *Let $q \geq 3$. Suppose that $(1, q - 1)$ is pure and $k_{1, q-1} = 2$. Then one of the following holds:*

- (i) $p_{(1, q-1), (1, q-1)}^{(2, q-2)} = 2$, $\Delta_q \simeq \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_{2q}, \{1, q + 1\})$, $\Gamma_{1, q-1}^i = \{\Gamma_{i, q-i}\}$ for $2 \leq i \leq q - 1$.
- (ii) $p_{(1, q-1), (1, q-1)}^{(2, q-2)} = 1$, $\Delta_q \simeq \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_q \times \mathbb{Z}_q, \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\})$, $|\Gamma_{1, q-1}^2| = 2$.

Proof. Similar to the proofs of Lemma 12 in [10] and Proposition 4.3 in [8]. $\square$

In the remaining of this paper, we assume that Γ is a commutative quasi-thin weakly distance-regular digraph.

Lemma 3.3 *Suppose $p_{(1, q-1), (1, q-1)}^{(1, q-2)} \neq 0$ and $(1, q - 2)$ is pure. The following hold:*

- (i) $p_{(1, q-1), (1, q-2)}^{(2, q-2)} \neq 0$ and $p_{(1, q-1), (1, q-1)}^{(2, q-2)} = 0$.
- (ii) *Any circuit of length q containing an arc of type $(1, q - 1)$ consists of arcs of types $(1, q - 1)$ and $(1, q - 2)$.*
- (iii) *If $|\Gamma_{1, q-1}^2| = 2$ and $k_{1, q-2} = 1$, then $p_{(1, q-1), (1, q-1)}^{(2, q-1)} \neq 0$.*

Proof. (i) Let (z, z_0) be an arc of type $(1, q - 1)$. Note that $p_{(1, q-1), (1, q-1)}^{(1, q-2)} \neq 0$. Pick a vertex $z_{q-2} \in P_{(q-1, 1), (1, q-2)}(z, z_0)$. Since $(1, q - 2)$ is pure, there exists a circuit $(z_0, z_1, \dots, z_{q-2})$ consisting of arcs of the same type. Hence, $\tilde{\partial}(z, z_1) = (2, q - 2)$. The fact that $\tilde{\partial}(z, z_0) = (1, q - 1)$ and $\tilde{\partial}(z_0, z_1) = (1, q - 2)$ imply $p_{(1, q-1), (1, q-2)}^{(2, q-2)} \neq 0$.

Suppose $p_{(1, q-1), (1, q-1)}^{(2, q-2)} \neq 0$. Let (y_0, y_1) and (y_1, y_2) be arcs of type $(1, q - 1)$ such that $\tilde{\partial}(y_0, y_2) = (2, q - 2)$. Since $p_{(1, q-1), (1, q-2)}^{(2, q-2)} \neq 0$, there exists a vertex $y'_1 \in P_{(1, q-1), (1, q-2)}(y_0, y_2)$. It follows that $k_{1, q-1} = 2$ and $p_{(1, q-1), (1, q-1)}^{(2, q-2)} = 1$. Lemma 2.2 implies that $p_{(1, q-1), (1, q-1)}^{(1, q-2)} = 2$ and (y'_1, y_1) is an arc of type $(1, q - 1)$. By Lemma 2.2, we get $q = 2$, a contradiction. Thus, (i) holds

(ii) Let $(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{q-1})$ be a circuit such that $\tilde{\partial}(x_{q-1}, x_0) = (1, q-1)$. Suppose $\tilde{\partial}(x_0, x_1) = (1, p-1)$ with $p \notin \{q, q-1\}$. It follows that $q > 3$ and $\partial(x_1, x_{q-1}) = q-2$.

Case 1. $\partial(x_{q-1}, x_1) = 1$.

Since $x_0 \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,p-1)}(x_{q-1}, x_1)$, there exists $y \in P_{(1,p-1),(1,q-1)}(x_{q-1}, x_1)$. Pick a vertex $z \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}(x_{q-1}, x_1)$. Note that $|\{x_0, y, z\}| = 3$. Since $(1, q-2)$ is pure, one gets $\tilde{\partial}(x_i, x_{i+1}) = (1, q-2)$ for $1 \leq i \leq q-2$, which implies $\{x_0, y, z\} \subseteq \Gamma_{2,q-2}(x_{q-2})$, contrary to $k_{2,q-2} \leq 2$.

Case 2. $\partial(x_{q-1}, x_1) = 2$.

Let (z'_0, z'_1) and (z'_1, z'_2) be arcs of type $(1, q-2)$ such that $\tilde{\partial}(z'_0, z'_2) = (2, q-3)$. By $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(1,q-2)} \neq 0$, there exists a vertex $z' \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}(z'_0, z'_1)$. Since $(1, q-2)$ is pure, one gets $\tilde{\partial}(z', z'_2) = (2, q-2)$. By $x_0 \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,p-1)}(x_{q-1}, x_1)$, there exists a vertex $w \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,p-1)}(z', z'_2)$, which implies $\tilde{\partial}(z'_0, w) = (2, q-2)$. Since $\tilde{\partial}(z'_0, z') = \tilde{\partial}(z', w) = (1, q-1)$, we have $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(2,q-2)} \neq 0$, contrary to (i).

Note that $\tilde{\partial}(x_i, x_{i+1}) = (1, q-1)$ or $(1, q-2)$ for $0 \leq i \leq q-2$. If $\tilde{\partial}(x_i, x_{i+1}) = (1, q-1)$ for each i , then $\tilde{\partial}(x_0, x_2) = (2, q-2)$, contrary to $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(2,q-2)} = 0$. Thus, (ii) holds.

(iii) By Lemma 2.1 (iii), $k_{1,q-1} = 2$. Since $k_{1,q-2} = 1$, we get $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(1,q-2)} = 2$ from Lemma 2.1 (v). Let $(w_0 = w_{q-1}, w_1, \dots, w_{q-2})$ be a circuit consisting of arcs of type $(1, q-2)$. Pick vertices $w' \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}(w_0, w_1)$ and $w'' \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}(w_1, w_2)$ such that $\tilde{\partial}(w', w'') \neq (1, q-2)$. Since $(1, q-2)$ is pure, $\tilde{\partial}(w_0, w'') = (2, q-2)$. By (i), one has $q-2 < \partial(w'', w') \leq 1 + \partial(w'', w_0) = q-1$. Since $q > 2$, we obtain $\partial(w', w'') = 2$ from Lemma 2.2. The desired result follows. $\square$

For any element a in a residue class ring, we assume that $\hat{a}$ denotes the minimum nonnegative integer in a .

The following theorem characterizes mixed arcs.

Theorem 3.4 *Let $(1, q-1) \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)$.*

(i) *If $p_{(1,s-1),(1,t-1)}^{(1,q-1)} \neq 0$ with $s < t$, then $s = 2$ and $t = q$.*

(ii) *The following are equivalent:*

(a) $(1, q-1)$ is mixed; (b) $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(1,q-2)} \neq 0$ and $(1, q-2)$ is pure; (c) $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(1,s-1)} \neq 0$ for some s .

(iii) *If $q > 2$ and $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(1,s-1)} \neq 0$, then $s = q-1$.*

Proof. First, we need two claims.

Claim 1. (i) is valid if $(1, q-1)$ is pure, or $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(1,q-2)} \neq 0$ and $(1, q-2)$ is pure.

Let x_0, x, x_1 be vertices such that $\tilde{\partial}(x_0, x) = (1, s-1)$, $\tilde{\partial}(x, x_1) = (1, t-1)$ and $\tilde{\partial}(x_0, x_1) = (1, q-1)$. By Lemma 2.2 and $s < t$, we have $s \neq q$ and $q > 2$. Suppose $t \neq q$. Observe that $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(2,q-2)} \neq 0$ or $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(1,q-2)} \neq 0$. Pick x_2 such that $\tilde{\partial}(x_1, x_2) = (1, q-1)$ and $\partial(x_2, x_0) = q-2$.

We conclude that $\tilde{\partial}(x, x_2) = (2, q-1)$. If $(1, q-1)$ is pure, by $q \notin \{s, t\}$, then our conclusion is valid. Suppose that $p_{(1, q-1), (1, q-1)}^{(1, q-2)} \neq 0$ and $(1, q-2)$ is pure. It follows from Lemma 3.3 (i) that $\tilde{\partial}(x_0, x_2) = (1, q-2)$.

Suppose $s = q-1$. Since $x_0 \in P_{(q-2, 1), (1, q-2)}(x, x_2)$ and $x \neq x_2$, by Lemma 2.2, we get $\tilde{\partial}(x, x_2) = (1, 1)$ or $(2, 2)$. In view of Lemma 2.3 and $t \neq q$, $\tilde{\partial}(x, x_2) = (2, 2)$. Since $t \neq q-1$, from Lemma 3.3 (ii), one has $\partial(x_2, x) > q-2$. Hence, $q = 3$, $s = 2$ and $t = 4$. By $x_1 \in P_{(1, 3), (1, 2)}(x, x_2)$, there exists a vertex $x'_1 \in P_{(1, 2), (1, 3)}(x_2, x)$, which implies $\partial(x_1, x'_1) = 2$. It follows from Lemma 3.3 (i) that $\partial(x'_1, x_1) = 2$. Then $\Gamma_{1, 2}^2 = \{\Gamma_{1, 1}, \Gamma_{2, 2}\}$. Since $x \neq x_2$, $k_{1, 1} = 2$. By Lemma 2.1 (i) and (v), we get $p_{(1, 2), (1, 2)}^{(1, 1)} = 1$. In view of Lemma 2.2, $p_{(1, 2), (1, 2)}^{(2, 2)} = 2$. Hence, $\tilde{\partial}(x, x_1) = (1, 2)$, a contradiction. Thus, $s \neq q-1$. Similarly, $t \neq q-1$.

Since $t \notin \{q-1, q\}$, by Lemma 3.3 (ii), we get $q-1 \leq \partial(x_2, x) \leq 1 + \partial(x_2, x_0) = q-1$. The fact that $s \notin \{q-1, q\}$ implies $\partial(x, x_2) = 2$. Therefore, our conclusion is valid.

Since $x \in P_{(1, s-1), (1, t-1)}(x_0, x_1)$, there exists a vertex $x' \in P_{(1, t-1), (1, s-1)}(x_0, x_1)$. Similarly, $\tilde{\partial}(x', x_2) = (2, q-1)$. Since $x_1 \in \Gamma_{1, t-1}(x) \cap \Gamma_{1, s-1}(x') \cap \Gamma_{q-1, 1}(x_2)$, there exist vertices $y'_1 \in P_{(1, q-1), (1, t-1)}(x, x_2)$ and $y''_1 \in P_{(1, q-1), (1, s-1)}(x, x_2)$. Hence, $k_{1, q-1} = 2$. Similarly, $y'_1, y''_1 \in \Gamma_{2, q-1}(x_0)$. Then $\Gamma_{1, s-1}\Gamma_{1, q-1} = \{\Gamma_{2, q-1}\}$. By Lemma 2.1 (i), we have $k_{1, s-1} = p_{(1, s-1), (1, q-1)}^{(2, q-1)}$. Since $x_1 \in P_{(1, t-1), (1, q-1)}(x, x_2)$, one gets $k_{1, s-1} = 1$. Similarly, $k_{1, t-1} = 1$. In view of $p_{(1, s-1), (1, t-1)}^{(1, q-1)} \neq 0$, we obtain $k_{1, q-1} = 1$, a contradiction. Thus, $t = q$. By Lemma 2.2, one has $s = 2$.

Claim 2. Let $(1, h-1), (1, l-1) \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)$ with $h, l > 2$ and $v = \min\{j \mid p_{(1, h-1), (1, l-1)}^{(i, j)} \neq 0\}$. Suppose that $(1, l-1)$ is pure, or $p_{(1, l-1), (1, l-1)}^{(1, l-2)} \neq 0$ and $(1, l-2)$ is pure. If $\Gamma_{1, l-1}^v \cap \Gamma_{l-1, 1}\Gamma_{h-1, 1} \neq \emptyset$, then $h = l$ or $p_{(1, h-1), (1, h-1)}^{(1, l-2)} \neq 0$.

Let $(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{v+1})$ be a circuit of length $v+2$ such that $\tilde{\partial}(x_{v+1}, x_0) = (1, h-1)$ and $\tilde{\partial}(x_i, x_{i+1}) = (1, l-1)$ for $0 \leq i \leq v$. Suppose that $h \neq l$.

Case 1. $(1, l-1)$ is pure.

Note that $v+2 > l$. Since $x_0 \neq x_l$, by Lemma 2.1 (iii), we have $k_{1, l-1} = 2$. In view of $l > 2$ and Lemma 3.2, we get $\Delta_l \simeq \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_{2l}, \{1, l+1\})$ or $\text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_l \times \mathbb{Z}_l, \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\})$.

Case 1.1. $\Delta_l \simeq \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_{2l}, \{1, l+1\})$.

In view of Lemma 3.2 (i), we obtain $\Gamma_{1, l-1}^i = \{\Gamma_{i, l-i}\}$ for $2 \leq i \leq l-1$. Then $\tilde{\partial}(x_0, x_{l-1}) = (l-1, 1)$. By Lemma 2.2, if $v \geq l$, then $\tilde{\partial}(x_0, x_{l+1}) = (1, l-1)$, contrary to the minimality of v ; if $v = l-1$, then $h = 2$, a contradiction.

Case 1.2. $\Delta_l \simeq \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_l \times \mathbb{Z}_l, \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\})$.

Let τ be an isomorphism from $\text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_l \times \mathbb{Z}_l, \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\})$ to Δ_l . Pick $\tau(a, b) \in \Gamma_{1, h-1}(\tau(0, 0))$. Then $0 \notin \{a, b\}$. Since $\tau(a, b) \in P_{(1, h-1), (l-\hat{a}, \hat{a})}(\tau(0, 0), \tau(0, b))$, we get $\tau(e+a, f+b) \in \Gamma_{1, h-1}(\tau(e, f)) \cap \Gamma_{\hat{a}, l-\hat{a}}(\tau(e, f+b))$ and $\tau(e+b, f+a) \in \Gamma_{1, h-1}(\tau(e, f)) \cap \Gamma_{\hat{a}, l-\hat{a}}(\tau(e+b, f))$ for each (e, f) . By $h \neq 2$, one has $\hat{a} + \hat{b} \neq l$.

Suppose $a = -1$. Since $(\tau(0, 0), \tau(1, 0), \tau(1+a, b) = \tau(0, b), \tau(0, b+1), \dots, \tau(0, l-1))$ is a circuit of length $l - \hat{b} + 2$ containing arcs of types $(1, h-1)$ and $(1, l-1)$, we get $b = 1$, contrary to $\hat{a} + \hat{b} \neq l$. Hence, $a \neq -1$. Similarly, $b \neq -1$. By $\Gamma_{1, l-1}^v \cap$

$\Gamma_{l-1,1}\Gamma_{h-1,1} \neq \emptyset$ and the minimality of v , one gets $v = \partial_\Gamma(\tau(a+1, b), \tau(0, 0)) = 2l - \hat{a} - \hat{b} - 1$. By $l - 1 \leq v$, we obtain $\hat{a} + \hat{b} < l$. Note that $(\tau(a+1, b), \tau(a+b+1, a+b), \tau(a+b+2, a+b), \dots, \tau(0, a+b), \tau(0, a+b+1), \tau(0, a+b+2), \dots, \tau(0, 0))$ is a path. If $a+b = -1$, then $l+1 - \hat{a} - \hat{b} \geq v$, contrary to $l > 2$; if $a+b \neq -1$, then $2l - 2\hat{a} - 2\hat{b} \geq v$, contrary to $\hat{a} + \hat{b} > 1$.

Case 2. $p_{(1,l-1),(1,l-1)}^{(1,l-2)} \neq 0$ and $(1, l-2)$ is pure.

Since $h \neq l$ and $h, l > 2$, one has $v \geq 2$. By the minimality of v , we obtain $\partial(x_j, x_{j+2}) = 2$ for $0 \leq j \leq v-1$. Therefore, $|\Gamma_{1,l-1}^2| = 2$. Lemma 2.1 (iii) implies $k_{1,l-1} = 2$. If $|P_{(1,l-1),(1,l-1)}(x_0, x_2)| = 2$, then there exists a vertex $x'_1 \in P_{(1,l-1),(1,l-1)}(x_0, x_2)$ such that $\partial(x'_1, x_3) = (1, l-2)$, contrary to the minimality of v . Then $|P_{(1,l-1),(1,l-1)}(x_0, x_2)| = 1$. By Lemma 2.2, $p_{(1,l-1),(1,l-1)}^{(1,l-2)} = 2$. It follows from Lemma 2.1 (i) and (v) that $k_{1,l-2} = 1$. In view of Lemma 3.3 (iii), we have $\tilde{\partial}(x_j, x_{j+2}) = (2, l-1)$ for each j . Hence, $v \geq l-1$. By Lemma 3.3 (i) and Lemma 2.1 (iii), we obtain $h \neq l-1$.

Let $(y_0, y_1, \dots, y_{v+1})$ be a path consisting of arcs of type $(1, l-1)$ such that $\tilde{\partial}(y_j, y_{j+2}) = (2, l-1)$ for each j . Pick x'_{v+1} and y'_{v+1} such that $\Gamma_{1,l-1}(x_v) = \{x_{v+1}, x'_{v+1}\}$ and $\Gamma_{1,l-1}(y_v) = \{y_{v+1}, y'_{v+1}\}$. Then $\tilde{\partial}(x_{v-1}, x'_{v+1}) = \tilde{\partial}(y_{v-1}, y'_{v+1}) = (1, l-2)$. Since $k_{1,l-2} = 1$, by Lemma 2.1 (iii) and the inductive hypothesis, we have $\tilde{\partial}(x_0, x'_{v+1}) = \tilde{\partial}(y_0, y'_{v+1})$, which implies $\tilde{\partial}(x_0, x_{v+1}) = \tilde{\partial}(y_0, y_{v+1})$. Thus, $\tilde{\partial}(x_0, x_{v+1})$ only depends on v .

Since $(1, l-2)$ is pure and $k_{1,l-2} = 1$, each $\Delta_{l-1}(x_i)$ is a circuit of length $l-1$, denoted by $(x_i = x_{0,i}, x_{1,i}, \dots, x_{l-2,i})$, where the first subscription of x are taken modulo $l-1$. The fact that $p_{(1,l-1),(1,l-1)}^{(1,l-2)} = 2$ implies that $\tilde{\partial}(x_{a,b}, x_{a,b+1}) = \tilde{\partial}(x_{a,b+1}, x_{a+1,b}) = (1, l-1)$ for any $a \in \{0, 1, \dots, l-2\}$ and $b \in \{0, 1, \dots, v\}$. By $k_{1,l-2} = 1$, one gets $\tilde{\partial}(x_{j,v-j+1}, x_{j+2,v-j-1}) = (2, l-1)$ for $0 \leq j \leq v-1$. Since $\tilde{\partial}(x_0, x_{v+1})$ only depends on v , we obtain $\tilde{\partial}(x_{0,v+1}, x_{v+1,0}) = \tilde{\partial}(x_0, x_{v+1}) = (h-1, 1)$. Let r be the minimal nonnegative integer such that $r \equiv v+1 \pmod{l-1}$. It suffices to show that $r = l-2$. Note that $(x_{0,0}, x_{1,0}, \dots, x_{r,0} = x_{v+1,0}, x_{0,v+1})$ is a circuit. By $h \neq 2$, $r \neq 0$. Since $h \neq l-1$ and $(1, l-2)$ is pure, one gets $r = l-2$.

This completes the proof of Claim 2.

(ii) (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b): By way of contradiction, we may assume that q is the minimal integer such that $(1, q-1)$ is mixed and (b) does not hold. Since $(1, 1)$ is pure, $q \geq 3$. Pick a circuit $(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{q-1})$ such that $\tilde{\partial}(x_{q-1}, x_0) = (1, q-1)$ and $\tilde{\partial}(x_0, x_1) = (1, c-1)$ with $c < q$.

Suppose $\partial(x_i, x_{i+1}) = (1, d-1)$ for some $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, q-2\}$ and $d \notin \{q, c\}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $i = q-2$. Claim 1 and the minimality of q imply $\tilde{\partial}(x_{q-2}, x_0) = \tilde{\partial}(x_{q-1}, x_1) = (2, q-2)$. Since $x_0 \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,c-1)}(x_{q-1}, x_1)$, there exist vertices $z_0 \in P_{(1,c-1),(1,q-1)}(x_{q-1}, x_1)$ and $z_{q-1} \in P_{(1,c-1),(1,q-1)}(x_{q-2}, x_0)$. Hence, $k_{1,q-1} = 2$. By Claim 1 and the minimality of q , we get $\tilde{\partial}(z_{q-1}, x_1) = (2, q-2)$ and $\Gamma_{1,q-1}\Gamma_{1,c-1} = \{\Gamma_{2,q-2}\}$. It follows from Lemma 2.1 (i) that $k_{1,c-1} = p_{(1,q-1),(1,c-1)}^{(2,q-2)}$. By $x_{q-1} \in P_{(1,d-1),(1,q-1)}(x_{q-2}, x_0)$, we obtain $k_{1,c-1} = 1$. Similarly, $k_{1,d-1} = 1$.

Since $k_{1,q-1} = 2$, by Lemma 2.1 (i), one gets $\tilde{\partial}(x_j, x_{j+1}) = (1, q'-1)$ for some

$j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q-3\}$, and $k_{1,q'-1} = 2$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $j = 1$. It follows from Claim 1 and the minimality of q that $\tilde{\partial}(z_0, x_2) = (2, q-2)$. Since $x_1 \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,q'-1)}(z_0, x_2)$, we have x_{q-1} or $z_{q-1} \in P_{(1,q'-1),(1,q-1)}(x_{q-2}, x_0)$, a contradiction. Hence, $\tilde{\partial}(x_i, x_{i+1}) = (1, q-1)$ or $(1, c-1)$ for each i .

Since $c < q$, by Claim 2 and Lemma 2.3, we have $\tilde{\partial}(x_i, x_{i+1}) = (1, q-1)$ for some $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, q-2\}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $i = q-2$. Suppose $\partial(x_{q-2}, x_0) = 2$. Then $\tilde{\partial}(x_{q-2}, x_0) = \tilde{\partial}(x_{q-1}, x_1) = (2, q-2)$. Since $x_{q-1} \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}(x_{q-2}, x_0)$, there exists a vertex $x'_0 \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}(x_{q-1}, x_1)$, which implies $k_{1,q-1} = 2$ and $\tilde{\partial}(x_{q-2}, x'_0) = (2, q-2)$. Hence, $\Gamma_{1,q-1}^2 = \{\Gamma_{2,q-2}\}$. By Lemma 2.2, we obtain $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(2,q-2)} = 2$ and $\tilde{\partial}(x_0, x_1) = (1, q-1)$, a contradiction. Thus, $\tilde{\partial}(x_{q-2}, x_0) = (1, q-2)$ and $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(1,q-2)} \neq 0$.

Note that $(1, q-2)$ is mixed. By the minimality of q , $p_{(1,q-2),(1,q-2)}^{(1,q-3)} \neq 0$ and $(1, q-3)$ is pure. It follows from Lemma 3.3 (ii) that the path $(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{q-2})$ contains an arc of type $(1, q-3)$. Hence, $c = q-2$ and $\tilde{\partial}(x_j, x_{j+1}) = (1, q-3)$ for $0 \leq j \leq q-3$. By Lemma 2.3, we get $q > 4$. In view of Claim 2, we obtain $p_{(1,q-2),(1,q-2)}^{(1,q-4)} \neq 0$, a contradiction. Thus, our desired result holds.

(b) $\Rightarrow$ (c): It is obvious.

(c) $\Rightarrow$ (a): Suppose that $(1, q-1)$ is pure. Then $|\Gamma_{1,q-1}^2| = 2$. By Lemma 2.1 (iii), we have $k_{1,q-1} = 2$. Lemma 3.2 implies that $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(2,q-2)} = 1$ and there exists an isomorphism τ from $\text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_q \times \mathbb{Z}_q, \{(1,0), (0,1)\})$ to Δ_q . It follows from Lemma 2.2, Lemma 2.1 (i) and (v) that $k_{1,s-1} = 1$. Observe that $(\tau(0,0), \tau(1,1), \dots, \tau(-1,-1))$ is a circuit consisting of arcs of type $(1, s-1)$. Since $s \neq q$ from Lemma 2.2, $(1, s-1)$ is mixed. Then $p_{(1,s-1),(1,s-1)}^{(1,s-2)} \neq 0$. By Lemma 2.1 (i), we get $(\tau(1,1), \tau(3,3)) \in \Gamma_{1,s-2}$ and $k_{1,s-2} = 1$. Note that $(\tau(0,0), \tau(1,0), \tau(1,1), \tau(3,3), \tau(4,4), \dots, \tau(-1,-1))$ is a circuit of length q containing arcs of types $(1, q-1)$ and $(1, s-2)$, contrary to the fact that $(1, q-1)$ is pure. Thus, we have the assertion.

(i) follows by (ii) and Claim 1.

(iii) By Lemma 2.2, $s \neq q$. (ii) implies that $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(1,q-2)} \neq 0$ and $(1, q-2)$ is pure. From Lemma 3.3 (iii), we only need to consider the case that $|\Gamma_{1,q-1}^2| = 2$ and $k_{1,q-2} = 2$. It follows from Lemma 2.1 (iii) that $k_{1,q-1} = 2$. By Lemma 2.1 (i) and (v), we have $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(1,q-2)} = 1$. Suppose $s \neq q-1$. In view of Lemma 2.2, one gets $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(1,s-1)} = 2$ and $k_{1,s-1} = 1$. Let (x_0, x) , (x, x_1) and (x, x'_1) be arcs of type $(1, q-1)$ such that $\tilde{\partial}(x_0, x_1) = (1, s-1)$ and $\tilde{\partial}(x_0, x'_1) = (1, q-2)$. Pick vertices x_2, z such that $\tilde{\partial}(x_1, x_2) = \tilde{\partial}(x, z) = (1, s-1)$. Since $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(1,s-1)} = 2$, we obtain $\tilde{\partial}(x_1, z) = \tilde{\partial}(x'_1, z) = \tilde{\partial}(z, x_2) = (1, q-1)$ and $\tilde{\partial}(x'_1, x_2) = (1, q-2)$. The fact that $x'_1 \in P_{(1,q-2),(1,q-2)}(x_0, x_2)$ and $k_{1,s-1} = 1$ imply that $(1, s-1)$ is mixed. It follows from (ii) that $\partial(x_0, x_2) = (1, s-2)$ and $(1, q-2)$ is mixed, contrary to the fact that $(1, q-2)$ is pure. $\square$

4 Configuration $C_{q,h}$

Let h and q be integers more than 2. If $\Gamma_{1,q-1}^2 = \{\Gamma_{2,q-2}\}$ and $\Gamma_{1,h-1}^2 \subseteq \Gamma_{1,q-1}\Gamma_{q-1,1}$, we call that the configuration $C_{q,h}$ exists.

Lemma 4.1 *Suppose that $C_{q,h}$ exists. Then $k_{1,h-1} = 1$, $k_{1,q-1} = 2$, $(1, q-1)$ is pure and $\Delta_q \simeq \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_{2q}, \{1, q+1\})$. Moreover, if $(1, q)$ is mixed, then $k_{1,q} = 2$.*

Proof. Pick four distinct vertices x, y, z, w such that $\tilde{\partial}(w, x) = \tilde{\partial}(w, y) = (1, q-1)$ and $\tilde{\partial}(x, z) = \tilde{\partial}(z, y) = (1, h-1)$. Then $k_{1,q-1} = 2$ and $|\Gamma_{1,h-1}^2| = 1$. Since $\Gamma_{1,q-1}^2 = \{\Gamma_{2,q-2}\}$, by Theorem 3.4 (ii), $(1, q-1)$ is pure. Lemma 3.2 implies $\Delta_q \simeq \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_{2q}, \{1, q+1\})$. So that there exists a vertex $w' \in P_{(q-1,1),(1,q-1)}(x, y)$ with $w' \neq w$. Write $\tilde{\partial}(x, y) = \tilde{f}$. By Lemma 2.1 (i) and (v), one has $k_{\tilde{f}} = 1$. Since $\Gamma_{1,h-1}^2 = \{\Gamma_{\tilde{f}}\}$, we obtain $k_{1,h-1} = 1$. If $(1, q)$ is mixed, then $k_{1,q} = 2$ from Theorem 3.4 (ii) and Lemma 2.1 (i). $\square$

Lemma 4.2 *Suppose that $C_{q,h}$ exists. The following hold:*

- (i) *If $(1, h-1)$ is pure, then $h = 4$.*
- (ii) *If $(1, h-1)$ is mixed, then $h = 3$.*

Proof. Let $(x, z), (z, y)$ be two arcs of type $(1, h-1)$. Observe $P_{(1,q-1),(q-1,1)}(x, y) \neq \emptyset$. It follows from Lemma 2.2 that $\partial(x, y) = \partial(y, x)$. In view of Lemma 4.1, one has $k_{1,h-1} = 1$. If $(1, h-1)$ is pure, by Lemma 2.1 (iii), then $\tilde{\partial}(x, y) = (2, 2)$ and $h = 4$; if $(1, h-1)$ is mixed, by Theorem 3.4 (ii), then $\tilde{\partial}(x, y) = (1, 1)$ and $h = 3$. $\square$

Lemma 4.3 *If $C_{q,h}$ exists, then $\Gamma_{1,q-1}\Gamma_{1,h-1} = \{\Gamma_{2,q}\}$ and $\Gamma_{q,2} \in \Gamma_{1,h-1}\Gamma_{1,q-1}^{q-1}$.*

Proof. Pick four distinct vertices x, y, z, w such that $\tilde{\partial}(x, y) = \tilde{\partial}(x, w) = (1, q-1)$ and $\tilde{\partial}(y, z) = \tilde{\partial}(z, w) = (1, h-1)$. By Lemma 4.1, $(1, q-1)$ is pure and $k_{1,h-1} = 1$. In view of Lemma 2.1 (iii), we have $|\Gamma_{1,q-1}\Gamma_{1,h-1}| = 1$. It follows from Theorem 3.4 (i) that $\partial(x, z) = 2$. Note that $q-1 \leq \partial(z, x) \leq 1 + \partial(w, x) = q$. It suffices to show that $\partial(z, x) = q$.

Assume the contrary, namely, there exists a path $(z = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{q-1} = x)$. Suppose that $\tilde{\partial}(x_i, x_{i+1}) = (1, p-1)$ for some $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, q-2\}$ and $p \neq q$. Since $k_{1,h-1} = 1$, $\tilde{\partial}(z, x_1) \neq (1, h-1)$. Hence, $p \neq h$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $i = q-2$. Since $(1, q-1)$ is pure, one has $\partial(y, x_{q-2}) = q-1$, which implies $\partial(x_{q-2}, y) = 2$. By $x \in P_{(1,p-1),(1,q-1)}(x_{q-2}, y)$, we get $\tilde{\partial}(w, z) = (1, p-1)$, contrary to $h \geq 3$. Hence, $\tilde{\partial}(x_i, x_{i+1}) = (1, q-1)$ for each i . It follows from Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 3.2 (i) that $\partial(z, x) = (q-1, 1)$, a contradiction. $\square$

Lemma 4.4 *If $(1, q-1)$ is mixed and $C_{q-1,h}$ exists, then $\Gamma_{1,q-1}\Gamma_{1,h-1} = \{\Gamma_{2,q}\}$ and $\Gamma_{q,2} \in \Gamma_{1,h-1}\Gamma_{1,q-2}^{q-2}\Gamma_{1,q-1}$.*

Proof. Let x, y, z be vertices such that $\tilde{\partial}(x, y) = (1, q-1)$ and $\tilde{\partial}(y, z) = (1, h-1)$. By Theorem 3.4 (ii), we have $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(1,q-2)} \neq 0$. Pick a vertex $w \in P_{(q-1,1),(1,q-2)}(x, y)$. It follows from Theorem 3.4 (i) that $\partial(x, z) = 2$. By Lemma 3.3 (ii), $\partial(z, x) \geq q-1$. In view of Lemma 4.3, we get $\tilde{\partial}(w, z) = (2, q-1)$, which implies $\tilde{\partial}(x, z) = (2, q)$ from Lemma 2.2. The desired results follow by Lemma 4.3. $\square$

Lemma 4.5 Suppose $q \geq 3$ and $p_{(1,q-1),(1,1)}^{(2,s)} \neq 0$. The following hold:

- (i) If $(1, q-1)$ is pure, then $s = q$ and $\Gamma_{q,2} \in \Gamma_{1,1}\Gamma_{1,q-1}^{q-1}$.
- (ii) If $(1, q-1)$ is mixed and $s = q$, then $\Gamma_{q,2} \in \Gamma_{1,1}\Gamma_{1,q-1}\Gamma_{1,q-2}^{q-2}$.

Proof. (i) Note that $s = q-1$ or q . Suppose for the contrary that $s = q-1$. Let x_{q-1}, x_q, x_0 be three vertices such that $\partial(x_{q-1}, x_q) = (1, q-1)$, $\partial(x_q, x_0) = (1, 1)$ and $\tilde{\partial}(x_{q-1}, x_0) = (2, q-1)$. Pick a path $(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{q-1})$.

Case 1. $\partial(x_{i+1}, x_i) \notin \{1, q-1\}$ for some $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, q-2\}$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume $\tilde{\partial}(x_{q-2}, x_{q-1}) = (1, p-1)$ with $p \notin \{2, q\}$. Since $(1, q-1)$ is pure, we get $\tilde{\partial}(x_{q-2}, x_q) = (2, q-1)$ from Theorem 3.4 (i). In view of $x_q \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,1)}(x_{q-1}, x_0)$, there exists a vertex $x' \in P_{(1,1),(1,q-1)}(x_{q-2}, x_q)$, which implies $k_{1,q-1} = 2$. Since $(1, q-1)$ is pure, by Theorem 3.4 (i), we have $\tilde{\partial}(x', x_0) = (2, q-1)$ and $\Gamma_{1,q-1}\Gamma_{1,1} = \{\Gamma_{2,q-1}\}$. It follows from Lemma 2.1 (i) that $k_{1,1} = p_{(1,q-1),(1,1)}^{(2,q-1)}$. In view of $x_{q-1} \in P_{(1,p-1),(1,q-1)}(x_{q-2}, x_q)$, we obtain $k_{1,1} = 1$. By $x_q \in P_{(1,q-1),(q-1,1)}(x', x_{q-1})$ and Lemma 2.2, one gets $\partial(x', x_{q-1}) = \partial(x_{q-1}, x')$. Since $x_{q-2} \in P_{(1,1),(1,p-1)}(x', x_{q-1})$, we obtain $\tilde{\partial}(x_{q-1}, x_{q-2}) = (1, p-1)$, contrary to $p \neq 2$.

Case 2. $\partial(x_{i+1}, x_i) \in \{1, q-1\}$ for $0 \leq i \leq q-2$.

Let $r-1$ be the number of arcs of type $(1, q-1)$ in the path $(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{q-1})$. Lemma 2.3 implies $r > 1$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $\tilde{\partial}(x_j, x_{j+1}) = (1, q-1)$ with $q-r \leq j \leq q-2$. It follows from Theorem 3.4 (ii) that $\tilde{\partial}(x_j, x_{j+2}) = (2, q-2)$ or $(2, q-1)$ for each j .

Suppose $\tilde{\partial}(x_j, x_{j+2}) = (2, q-1)$ for some j . Note that $\Gamma_{1,q-1}^2 = \{\Gamma_{2,q-2}, \Gamma_{2,q-1}\}$. It follows from Lemma 2.1 (iii) that $k_{1,q-1} = 2$. Lemma 3.2 implies $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(2,q-2)} =$

1. By Lemma 2.2, $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(2,q-1)} = 2$. Hence, $\tilde{\partial}(x_q, x_0) = (1, q-1)$, a contradiction.

Suppose $\tilde{\partial}(x_j, x_{j+2}) = (2, q-2)$ for each j . Since $\tilde{\partial}(x_{q-1}, x_0) \neq (1, q-1)$, we have $r < q$ from Lemma 3.2. Hence, $\tilde{\partial}(x_{q-r}, x_q) = (r, q-r)$. By Lemma 2.3, $r = \frac{q}{2}$. Since $\tilde{\partial}(x_0, x_r) = (\frac{q}{2}, \frac{q}{2})$, there exists a path $(y_r = x_r, y_{r+1}, \dots, y_q = x_0)$ consisting of arcs of type $(1, q-1)$. Then $(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_r = y_r, y_{r+1}, \dots, y_{q-1})$ is a circuit of length q containing arcs of types $(1, q-1)$ and $(1, 1)$, a contradiction.

(ii) It is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.4 (ii). $\square$

Let $A_{i,j}$ denote a binary matrix with rows and columns indexed by $V\Gamma$ such that $(A_{i,j})_{x,y} = 1$ if and only if $\tilde{\partial}(x, y) = (i, j)$.

Lemma 4.6 Suppose that $q > 2$, $(1, q-1)$ is pure and $\Delta_q \simeq \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_{2q}, \{1, q+1\})$.

The following hold:

- (i) If $(1, 1) \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)$, then $A_{1,q-1}A_{1,1} = A_{1,q-1}$ or $A_{1,q-1}A_{1,1} = k_{1,1}A_{2,q}$.

- (ii) If $(1, q)$ is mixed, then $A_{1,q-1}A_{1,q} = 2A_{2,q-1}$ and $A_{1,q}^2 = 2A_{1,q-1}$.
- (iii) If $(1, q)$ is mixed and $A_{1,q-1}A_{1,1} = A_{1,q-1}$, then $A_{1,q}A_{1,1} = A_{1,q}$.
- (iv) If $(1, q)$ is mixed and $A_{1,q-1}A_{1,1} = k_{1,1}A_{2,q}$, then $A_{1,q}A_{1,1} = k_{1,1}A_{2,q+1}$.

Proof. (i) Suppose $p_{(1,q-1),(1,1)}^{(1,q-1)} \neq 0$. Since $\Delta_q \simeq \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_{2q}, \{1, q+1\})$, we obtain $p_{(1,q-1),(q-1,1)}^{(1,1)} = 2$. By Lemma 2.1 (i) and (v), we get $k_{1,1} = 1$, which implies $A_{1,q-1}A_{1,1} = A_{1,q-1}$ from Lemma 2.1 (iii). Suppose $p_{(1,q-1),(1,1)}^{(1,q-1)} = 0$. By Theorem 3.4 (i) and Lemma 4.5 (i), we have $\Gamma_{1,q-1}\Gamma_{1,1} = \{\Gamma_{2,q}\}$, which implies $A_{1,q-1}A_{1,1} = k_{1,1}A_{2,q}$ from Lemma 2.1 (i).

(ii) By Theorem 3.4 (ii), we get $p_{(1,q),(1,q)}^{(1,q-1)} \neq 0$. Since $k_{1,q-1} = 2$, from Lemma 2.1 (i), we have $k_{1,q} = 2$.

Let x, y, z, w be vertices such that $\tilde{\partial}(x, y) = (1, q-1)$, $\tilde{\partial}(y, z) = (1, q)$ and $w \in P_{(1,q-1),(q,1)}(y, z)$. By Lemma 3.2 (i), we have $\partial(x, w) = (2, q-2)$. In view of Theorem 3.4 (i), one gets $\tilde{\partial}(x, z) = (2, q-1)$. Hence, $A_{1,q-1}A_{1,q} = 2A_{2,q-1}$.

By Lemma 3.2 (i), there exists a vertex $y' \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}(x, w)$ with $y \neq y'$. Since $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q)}^{(2,q-1)} = 2$, $\tilde{\partial}(y', z) = (1, q)$. Hence, $A_{1,q}^2 = 2A_{1,q-1}$.

(iii) By Lemma 2.1 (i), we have $k_{1,1} = 1$. Let x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3 be vertices such that $\tilde{\partial}(x_0, x_2) = (1, q-1)$, $x_1 \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,1)}(x_0, x_2)$ and $x_3 \in P_{(1,q),(1,q)}(x_0, x_2)$. It follows from (ii) that $\tilde{\partial}(x_3, x_1) = (1, q)$. Since $x_1 \in P_{(1,q),(1,1)}(x_3, x_2)$, by Lemma 2.1 (i), we get $A_{1,q}A_{1,1} = A_{1,q}$.

(iv) Let z_0, z_1, z_2, z'_0 be vertices such that $\tilde{\partial}(z_0, z_1) = (1, q)$, $\tilde{\partial}(z_1, z_2) = (1, 1)$ and $z'_0 \in P_{(q,1),(1,q-1)}(z_0, z_1)$. Since $A_{1,q-1}A_{1,1} = k_{1,1}A_{2,q}$, $\tilde{\partial}(z'_0, z_2) = (2, q)$. In view of (ii), one has $\partial(z_0, z_2) \neq (1, q)$, which implies $\partial(z_0, z_2) = 2$ from Theorem 3.4 (i). Since $\tilde{\partial}(z'_0, z_2) = (2, q)$, by Lemma 2.2, we get $\partial(z_2, z_0) \neq q$. It follows from Lemma 3.3 (ii) and Theorem 3.4 (ii) that $\partial(z_2, z_0) = q+1$. The desired result holds by Lemma 2.1 (i). $\square$

Lemma 4.7 Suppose that $(1, 1) \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)$ and $C_{q,h}$ exists. The following hold:

- (i) $h = 3$, $k_{1,1} = 1$ and $A_{1,q-1}A_{1,1} = A_{1,q-1}$.
- (ii) If $(1, q)$ is mixed, then $A_{1,q}A_{1,1} = A_{1,q}$.

Proof. (i) Let x, y, z be vertices such that $\tilde{\partial}(x, y) = (1, q-1)$ and $\tilde{\partial}(y, z) = (1, 1)$. Suppose that $\tilde{\partial}(x, z) = (2, q)$. Since $C_{q,h}$ exists, by Lemma 4.3, there exists a vertex $w \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,h-1)}(x, z)$, which implies $\tilde{\partial}(z, y) = (1, h-1)$, contrary to $h \geq 3$. It follows from Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.6 (i) that $A_{1,q-1}A_{1,1} = A_{1,q-1}$ and $\tilde{\partial}(x, z) = (1, q-1)$. Then $\Gamma_{1,h-1}^2 = \{\Gamma_{1,1}\}$ and $h = 3$. In view of Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 2.1 (i), we get $k_{1,1} = 1$.

(ii) It is an immediate consequence of Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.6 (iii). $\square$

Lemma 4.8 If $C_{q,h}$ and $C_{q',h'}$ both exist, then $h = h'$.

Proof. If $(1, 1) \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)$, by Lemma 4.7 (i), then $h = h' = 3$; if $(1, 1) \notin \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)$, by Theorem 3.4 (ii) and Lemma 4.2, then $h = h' = 4$. $\square$

Proposition 4.9 *If $C_{q,h}$ exists, then $\Delta_{q,h} \simeq \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_q \times \mathbb{Z}_4, \{(1,0), (0,1), (1,2)\})$ for $q > 2$ and $q \neq h$.*

Proof. For fixed $x \in V\Gamma$, by Lemma 4.1, there exists an isomorphism τ from $\text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_{2q}, \{1, q+1\})$ to $\Delta_q(x)$. Write $\tau(a) = (a, 0)$ for each $a \in \mathbb{Z}_{2q}$. Suppose that there exists a vertex $(s, 0) \in \Gamma_{1,h-1}(0, 0)$. From Lemma 3.2 (i), we have $s = q$. Since $(1, 0) \in P_{(1,q-1),(q-1,1)}((0, 0), (q, 0))$, by Lemma 2.2, we get $h = 2$, contrary to $h \geq 3$. Hence, $\Gamma_{1,h-1} \not\subseteq \langle \Gamma_{1,q-1} \rangle$ and $V\Delta_{q,h}(x)$ has a partition $F_q(x) \dot{\cup} F_q(x')$. By Lemma 4.1, $\sigma : F_q(x) \rightarrow F_q(x')$, $y \mapsto y'$ is an isomorphism from $\Delta_q(x)$ to $\Delta_q(x')$, where $y' \in \Gamma_{1,h-1}(y)$. Write $\sigma(a, 0) = (a, 1)$ for each a . Since $C_{q,h}$ exists, $((a, 1), (a + q, 0)) \in \Gamma_{1,h-1}$. The desired result holds. $\square$

5 A property

Let $\mathcal{B}$ be the set consisting of $(p, p-1)$ and $(p-1, p)$ where $(1, p-1)$ is mixed, $\mathcal{C} = \{(p, q) \mid C_{p,q} \text{ or } C_{q,p} \text{ exists}\}$ and $\mathcal{D} = \{(p, q) \mid (p, p-1) \in \mathcal{B} \text{ and } C_{p-1,q} \text{ exists, or } (q, q-1) \in \mathcal{B} \text{ and } C_{q-1,p} \text{ exists}\}$.

In this section, we will prove the following result.

Theorem 5.1 *Let $(1, q-1), (1, p-1) \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)$, where $q, p > 2$ and $p \neq q$. Then $(q, p) \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}$.*

We shall prove Theorem 5.1 by contradiction. Let

$$l = \min \left\{ r \mid p_{(1,i-1),(1,j-1)}^{(2,r)} \neq 0, i \neq j, i, j \geq 3, (i, j) \notin \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D} \right\}.$$

We may assume $p_{(1,q-1),(1,p-1)}^{(2,l)} \neq 0$. By Lemma 3.3 (ii) and Theorem 3.4 (ii), $l \geq 3$.

Choose vertices x, y and z with $\tilde{\partial}(x, y) = (1, q-1)$, $\tilde{\partial}(y, z) = (1, p-1)$ and $\tilde{\partial}(x, z) = (2, l)$. Then there exists y' such that $\tilde{\partial}(x, y') = (1, p-1)$ and $\tilde{\partial}(y', z) = (1, q-1)$.

The minimality of l will be used many times in the sequel, so we will not refer to it every time for the sake of simplicity.

Now we divide the proof of Theorem 5.1 into two subsections according to separate assumptions, respectively.

5.1 There exists a shortest path from z to x containing an arc of type $(1, h-1)$ with $h \notin \{2, q, p\}$

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $(z = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_l = x)$ is a path such that $\tilde{\partial}(x_0, x_1) = (1, h-1)$. For each i , write $h_i = \partial(x_{i+1}, x_i) + 1$.

Step 1 Show that $C_{t,h}$ exists for some t .

Assume the contrary, namely, $C_{t,h}$ does not exist for any t . Suppose that $(h, q), (h, p) \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}$. Observe $\{(h, q), (h, p)\} \not\subseteq \mathcal{B}$. It follows from Lemma 4.8 that $\{(h, q), (h, p)\} \not\subseteq \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $(h, q) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $(h, p) \in \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}$. If $C_{h,p}$ exists, by Lemma 4.1, then $q = h + 1$ and $(1, q - 1)$ is mixed, contrary to $(q, p) \notin \mathcal{D}$. If $(1, h - 1)$ is mixed and $C_{h-1,p}$ exists, then $C_{q,p}$ exists, a contradiction. Thus, (h, q) or $(h, p) \notin \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $(h, p) \notin \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}$. Theorem 3.4 (i) implies $\tilde{\partial}(y, x_1) = (2, l)$. Since $z \in P_{(1,p-1),(1,h-1)}(y, x_1)$, there exists a vertex $y'' \in P_{(1,h-1),(1,p-1)}(x, z)$, which implies $k_{1,p-1} = 2$. By Theorem 3.4 (i) again, we get $\partial(y', x_1) = 2$ and $\tilde{\partial}(y'', x_1) = (2, l)$. Then $\Gamma_{1,p-1}\Gamma_{1,h-1} = \{\Gamma_{2,l}\}$. In view of Lemma 2.1 (i), $k_{1,h-1} = p_{(1,p-1),(1,h-1)}^{(2,l)} = 1$. By $k_{2,l} \leq 2$, one has $\partial(x_1, y') < l$. Hence, $(h, q) \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}$. Since $k_{1,h-1} = 1$, one gets $(h, q) \in \mathcal{B}$ from Lemma 4.1. Suppose that $(1, q - 1)$ is mixed. By Theorem 3.4 (ii) and Lemma 2.1 (ii), one has $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(1,h-1)} = k_{1,q-1}$, which implies $\tilde{\partial}(y, y'') = (1, q - 1)$. In view of Lemma 2.2, $q = 2$, a contradiction. Now suppose that $(1, h - 1)$ is mixed. By Theorem 3.4 (ii) again, $\tilde{\partial}(y'', y) = (1, h - 1)$. In view of Lemma 2.2 again, $h = 2$, a contradiction. Thus, $C_{t,h}$ exists for some t .

Step 2 Show that $\{(q, h), (p, h)\} \not\subseteq \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}$.

Suppose for the contrary that $\{(q, h), (p, h)\} \subseteq \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}$. By Step 1 and Lemma 4.1, we have $k_{1,h-1} = 1$. We conclude that $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_l)$ consists of arcs of types $(1, q - 1)$ and $(1, p - 1)$.

By Lemma 4.8, $C_{q,h}$ exists, or $C_{q-1,h}$ exists and $(1, q - 1)$ is mixed. Suppose $h_{l-1} = 2$. By Lemma 4.7 (i) or (ii), we have $\tilde{\partial}(x_{l-1}, y) = (1, q - 1)$. Theorem 3.4 (i) implies $\partial(x_{l-1}, z) = 2$, contrary to $\partial(z, x_{l-1}) < l$. Then $h_j \neq 2$ for $1 \leq j \leq l - 1$. Step 1 and Lemma 4.8 imply that $h_j \in \{q, p, h\}$ for any j . Since $h \notin \{q, p\}$, one gets $l \geq 4$ from Lemma 3.3 (ii) and Theorem 3.4 (ii). If $h_j = h$ for any j , by Lemma 4.2 and $k_{1,h-1} = 1$, then $(1, h - 1)$ is pure and $h = 4$, which imply $z = x_4$, a contradiction. In the path $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_l)$, without loss of generality, we may assume that the number of arcs of type $(1, p - 1)$ is not less than the number of arcs of type $(1, q - 1)$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume $h_{l-1} = p$. By Lemma 4.8 again, $C_{p,h}$ exists, or $C_{p-1,h}$ exists and $(1, p - 1)$ is mixed. Suppose that $C_{p-1,h}$ exists and $(1, p - 1)$ is mixed. Then $p \geq 4$. In view of Lemmas 4.1 and 4.8, we obtain $(q, p - 1) \notin \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}$. Lemma 4.6 (ii) implies $\tilde{\partial}(x_{l-1}, y') = (1, p - 2)$. It follows from Theorem 3.4 (i) that $\partial(x_{l-1}, z) = 2$, contrary to $\partial(z, x_{l-1}) < l$. Hence, $C_{p,h}$ exists. Suppose $h_1 = h$. Then $\tilde{\partial}(y, x_2) = (1, p - 1)$. By Theorem 3.4 (i) again, one has $\partial(x, x_2) = 2$, contrary to $\partial(x_2, x) < l$. Thus, $h_j \in \{q, p\}$ for $1 \leq j \leq l - 1$.

Suppose $h_j = p$ for each j . Since $C_{p,h}$ exists, by Lemma 4.3, we get $\partial(x_1, y) = p$, and so $l \geq p$. In view of Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 3.2 (i), one has $\tilde{\partial}(x_1, x_p) = (p - 1, 1)$. Since $\tilde{\partial}(y', z) = (1, q - 1)$, we obtain $\tilde{\partial}(x, x_1) \neq (1, p - 1)$ and $l > p$. Let $x_{l+1} = y'$. By Lemma 3.2 (i), one gets $\tilde{\partial}(x_1, x_{p+2}) = (1, p - 1)$. Then $x_{p+2} = y'$ and (y', z, x_1) is a circuit, a contradiction. Therefore, our conclusion is valid.

Without loss of generality, we may assume $h_{l-3} = q$ and $h_{l-2} = p$. Observe that $C_{p,h}$ exists and $(q, h) \in \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}$. From Lemmas 4.1 and 4.8, we get $k_{1,q-1} =$

$k_{1,p-1} = 2$ and there exists a vertex $x'_{l-1} \in P_{(1,p-1),(1,p-1)}(x_{l-2}, x)$ with $x'_{l-1} \neq x_{l-1}$. Hence, $x_{l-1}, x'_{l-1} \in \Gamma_{2,l}(x_{l-3})$. It follows that $A_{1,q-1}A_{1,p-1} = 2A_{2,l}$ and $\tilde{\partial}(x_{l-1}, z) = \tilde{\partial}(x, x_1) = (3, l-1)$. Since $x \in P_{(1,p-1),(2,l)}(x_{l-1}, z)$, there exists a vertex $z'' \in P_{(2,l),(1,p-1)}(x, x_1)$, which implies $\tilde{\partial}(y', z'') = (1, q-1)$. Then $\tilde{\partial}(y', x_1) = (2, l)$ and $\tilde{\partial}(z, x_1) = (1, p-1)$, contrary to $h \neq p$. The desired result follows.

In the following, we reach a contradiction based on the above discussion.

By Step 2, we may assume $(p, h) \notin \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}$. It follows from Step 1 and Lemma 4.1 that $k_{1,h-1} = 1$. In view of Theorem 3.4 (i), we have $\partial(y, x_1) = \partial(y', x_1) = 2$.

Case 1. $\partial(x_1, y) = l$.

Since $y' \in P_{(1,p-1),(1,q-1)}(x, z)$, there exists a vertex $z' \in P_{(1,p-1),(1,q-1)}(y, x_1)$. Then $k_{1,p-1} = 2$. By Theorem 3.4 (i), we have $\tilde{\partial}(x, z') = (2, l)$, which implies $\Gamma_{1,q-1}\Gamma_{1,p-1} = \{\Gamma_{2,l}\}$. In view of Lemma 2.1 (i), $k_{1,q-1} = p_{(1,q-1),(1,p-1)}^{(2,l)}$. By $z \in P_{(1,p-1),(1,h-1)}(y, x_1)$, $k_{1,q-1} = 1$. Since $k_{1,h-1} = 1$, from Lemma 2.1 (iv), we obtain $\partial(x_1, y') < l$. Note that $(q, h) \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}$. From Lemma 4.1, one has $(q, h) \in \mathcal{B}$. By Theorem 3.4 (ii), we get $\tilde{\partial}(z, z') = (1, q-1)$ or $\tilde{\partial}(z', z) = (1, h-1)$, contrary to Lemma 2.2.

Case 2. $\partial(x_1, y) < l$.

Note that $(p, h) \in \mathcal{B}$. By Lemma 4.2, $(1, p-1)$ is mixed and $p = h+1 = 5$. Since $k_{1,3} = 1$, one gets $k_{1,4} = p_{(1,4),(1,4)}^{(1,3)}$ from Theorem 3.4 (ii) and Lemma 2.1 (ii). If $\partial(x_1, y') = l$, then there exists a vertex $w \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,4)}(y', x_1)$, which implies $\tilde{\partial}(z, w) = (1, 4)$, contrary to Lemma 2.2. Hence, $\partial(x_1, y') < l$.

Pick a vertex $w' \in \Gamma_{1,3}(y)$. Since $k_{1,4} = p_{(1,4),(1,4)}^{(1,3)}$, one has $\tilde{\partial}(z, w') = \tilde{\partial}(w', x_1) = (1, 4)$. The fact that $\partial(x_1, y') < l$ implies $(q, 4) \in \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}$. By Lemma 4.8, $C_{q,4}$ exists, or $C_{q-1,4}$ exists and $(1, q-1)$ is mixed. In view of Lemma 4.3 or 4.4, we get $q = \partial(x_1, y') < \partial(z, x) \leq 1 + \partial(w', x) = q+1$. Thus, $l = q+1$.

Suppose that $C_{q,4}$ exists. Pick a vertex $x'_2 \in P_{(1,3),(4,1)}(w', x_1)$. Then $\tilde{\partial}(x, x'_2) = (1, q-1)$. By Lemma 4.1, there exists a circuit $(x'_2, x'_3, \dots, x'_l = x)$ consisting of arcs of type $(1, q-1)$. Since $(z, x_1, x'_2, x'_3, \dots, x'_l)$ is a shortest path, $\tilde{\partial}(x_1, x'_3) = (2, l)$. It follows that $\tilde{\partial}(x'_{l-1}, z) = \tilde{\partial}(x, x_1) = (3, l-1)$. The fact that $x \in P_{(1,q-1),(2,l)}(x'_{l-1}, z)$ and $\partial(x_1, y) < l$ imply $\tilde{\partial}(x'_2, x_1) = (2, l)$, a contradiction.

Suppose that $C_{q-1,4}$ exists and $(1, q-1)$ is mixed. Since $(1, 4)$ is mixed, by Lemma 4.1, we obtain $q \geq 7$. It follows from Lemma 4.4 that there exists a vertex y_1 such that $\tilde{\partial}(w', y_1) = (1, q-2)$ and $\partial(y_1, x) = q-1$. By Lemma 4.8, we have $(5, q-1) \notin \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}$. Theorem 3.4 (i) implies $\tilde{\partial}(z, y_1) = (2, l) = (2, q+1)$. In view of $w' \in P_{(1,4),(1,q-2)}(z, y_1)$, there exists a vertex $y'' \in P_{(1,4),(1,q-2)}(x, z)$. By Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.6 (ii), we get $\tilde{\partial}(y'', y') = (1, q-1)$, contrary to Lemma 2.2.

By the above discussion, we complete the proof of Theorem 5.1 under this assumption.

5.2 Each arc of any shortest path from z to x is of type $(1, 1)$, $(1, q-1)$ or $(1, p-1)$

Let $(z = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_l = x)$ be a path. For each i , write $h_i = \partial(x_{i+1}, x_i) + 1$. Note that $h_i \in \{2, q, p\}$.

Step 1 Show that $|\{i \mid h_i \neq 2, 0 \leq i \leq l-1\}| \geq 2$ and $|\{h_i \mid 0 \leq i \leq l-1\}| \geq 2$.

Suppose $h_j = 2$ for $0 \leq j \leq l-2$. It follows from Lemma 2.3 that $l = 3$ or 4 . Then $k_{1,1} = 2$ and Δ_2 is not isomorphic to C_3 . In view of Lemma 3.1, $(1, 3) \notin \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)$ or $(1, 3)$ is mixed. Since $(q, p) \notin \mathcal{B}$, one gets $\{q, p\} \neq \{3, 4\}$ from Theorem 3.4 (ii). By Lemma 3.3 (ii), we have $l = 4$ and $5 \in \{q, p\}$. Theorem 3.4 (i) implies $\partial(y, x_1) = \partial(y', x_1) = 2$. Since $\partial(x_1, y) \leq 4$ and $\partial(x_1, y') \leq 4$, $(1, 4)$ is mixed from Lemma 4.5 (i). By Theorem 3.4 (ii), $(1, 3)$ is pure, a contradiction. Hence, the first statement is valid. By the Claim 2 and (iii) in Theorem 3.4, the second statement is valid.

Step 2 Show that $k_{1,q-2} = 1$ if $|\{i \mid h_i = q\}| \geq 2$ and $(1, q-1)$ is mixed.

Without loss of generality, we may assume $h_{l-2} = h_{l-1} = q$. Since $\partial(x_{l-2}, x) = 2$, we have $|\Gamma_{1,q-1}^2| = 2$ from Theorem 3.4 (ii). Lemma 2.1 (iii) implies $k_{1,q-1} = 2$. Suppose $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(1,q-2)} = 1$. It follows from Lemma 2.2 that there exists a vertex $x'_{l-1} \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}(x_{l-2}, x)$ such that $\tilde{\partial}(x'_{l-1}, y) = (1, q-2)$. Pick a vertex $x' \in P_{(1,q-2),(1,q-1)}(x_{l-2}, y)$. By Theorem 3.4 (i), one gets $\partial(x', z) = 2$, contrary to $\partial(z, x') < l$. Hence, $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(1,q-2)} = 2$. In view of Lemma 2.1 (i) and (v), we obtain $k_{1,q-2} = 1$.

Step 3 Show that $\partial(x_{l-1}, z) \geq 2$.

Suppose for the contrary that $\partial(x_{l-1}, z) = 1$.

Case 1. $(1, l-1)$ is mixed.

By Theorem 3.4 (ii), $(1, l-2)$ is pure and there exists a vertex x'_{l-2} such that $\tilde{\partial}(x'_{l-2}, x_{l-1}) = (1, l-1)$ and $\tilde{\partial}(x'_{l-2}, z) = (1, l-2)$. Observe that $l-1, l \in \{2, q, p\}$. Since $(q, p) \notin \mathcal{B}$, $l = 3$. From Lemma 3.3 (ii), $\{q, p\} = \{3, 4\}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $p = 4$. By Theorem 3.4 (ii), $(1, 3)$ is pure. In view of $\partial(x'_{l-2}, y) \leq 3$ and Lemma 4.5 (i), we get $\partial(y, x'_{l-2}) = 1$. It follows from Theorem 3.4 (i) that $\tilde{\partial}(y, x'_{l-2}) = (1, 3)$ and $\partial(x, x'_{l-2}) = 2$, contrary to $\partial(x'_{l-2}, x) < l$.

Case 2. $(1, l-1)$ is pure.

Observe that $l \in \{q, p\}$.

Case 2.1. $h_{l-1} \neq 2$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume $h_{l-1} = q$. By $l \geq 3$ and Lemma 2.2, one has $l = p$. Then $k_{1,p-1} = 2$ and $h_j = p$ for $0 \leq j \leq l-2$.

We claim that $k_{1,q-1} = 2$ and there exists $z' \in P_{(1,p-1),(1,p-1)}(y, x_1) \setminus \{z\}$. Lemma 3.2 implies $\Delta_p \simeq \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_{2p}, \{1, p+1\})$ or $\text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_p \times \mathbb{Z}_p, \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\})$. Suppose $\Delta_p \simeq \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_{2p}, \{1, p+1\})$. Since $C_{p,q}$ does not exist, we have $|\Gamma_{1,q-1}^2| = 2$. By Lemma 2.1 (iii), $k_{1,q-1} = 2$. It follows from Lemma 3.2 (i) that the claim is valid. Suppose $\Delta_p \simeq \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_p \times \mathbb{Z}_p, \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\})$. Then $|P_{(1,p-1),(p-1,1)}(x_{l-1}, y)| = 1$. Lemma 2.1 (v) implies $k_{\tilde{\partial}(x_{l-1}, y)} = 2$. By Lemma 2.1 (i), $k_{1,q-1} = 2$. Since $\tilde{\partial}(x_{l-1}, x_1) =$

$(2, p-2)$, one has $\tilde{\partial}(y, x_1) \neq (2, p-2)$ from Lemma 3.2 (ii). In view of Lemma 2.2, the claim is valid.

By Theorem 3.4 (i), we have $\tilde{\partial}(x, z') = (2, l)$ and $A_{1,q-1}A_{1,p-1} = 2A_{2,l}$, which imply $\tilde{\partial}(x, x_{l-1}) = (1, q-1)$, contrary to $q \neq 2$.

Case 2.2. $h_{l-1} = 2$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume $l = q$. By $x_{l-1} \neq y'$, $k_{1,q-1} = 2$. Since $z \in P_{(1,q-1),(q-1,1)}(x_{l-1}, y')$, we have $\tilde{\partial}(y', x_{l-1}) = (2, 2)$ from Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3. In view of $x \in P_{(1,1),(1,p-1)}(x_{l-1}, y')$, there exists a vertex $x'' \in P_{(1,p-1),(1,1)}(y', x_{l-1})$. Then $x'' \neq x$ and $k_{1,1} = 2$. The fact that $\tilde{\partial}(x_{l-1}, y') = (2, 2)$ implies $p_{(1,q-1),(q-1,1)}^{(1,1)} = 0$. Since $(1, q-1)$ is pure, by Theorem 3.4 (i) and Lemma 4.5 (i), we have $A_{1,1}A_{1,q-1} = 2A_{2,q}$. Hence, $\tilde{\partial}(x, y') = (1, 1)$, a contradiction.

Step 4 Show that $p_{(1,s-1),(1,1)}^{(2,l-1)} \neq 0$ for some $s > 2$ if $\partial(x_{l-1}, z) = 2$.

Pick a path (x_{l-1}, w, z) such that $\tilde{\partial}(x_{l-1}, w) = (1, s-1)$, $\tilde{\partial}(w, z) = (1, t-1)$ and $s \geq t$. By Step 1, we may assume $h_0 = q$. If $t = 2$, then $s > 2$ since $l \geq 3$, and the desired result holds. Suppose $t \neq 2$. Since $(q, p) \notin \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}$, from Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4, we have $t = s$ or $(s, t) \in \mathcal{B}$.

Case 1. $s = t$.

Since $\partial(x_1, w) < l$, by Theorem 3.4 (i), one has $t = q$ or $(t, q) \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}$.

Case 1.1. $t = q$.

Suppose $\tilde{\partial}(x_{l-1}, y') = (1, q-1)$. By Theorem 3.4 (i), we have $h_{l-1} = p$. It follows from Theorem 3.4 (ii) and (iii) that $(1, p-1)$ is mixed and $q = p-1$, contrary to $(q, p) \notin \mathcal{B}$. Hence, $w \neq y'$, $k_{1,q-1} = 2$ and $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(2,l-1)} = 1$.

Case 1.1.1. $(1, q-1)$ is pure.

By Lemma 3.2, we have $|\Gamma_{1,q-1}^2| = 2$ and $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(2,q-2)} = 1$. In view of Lemma 2.2, one gets $\tilde{\partial}(x_{l-1}, z) = (2, q-2)$, which implies $l = q-1$ and $\tilde{\partial}(w, x_1) = (2, q-2)$. It follows from Theorem 3.4 (ii) that $\tilde{\partial}(y', x_1) = (2, q-1)$. By Lemma 2.2 again, we obtain $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(2,q-1)} = 2$. Then $\tilde{\partial}(x, y') = (1, q-1)$, a contradiction.

Case 1.1.2. $(1, q-1)$ is mixed.

By Theorem 3.4 (ii), $(1, q-2)$ is pure. Since $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(2,l-1)} = 1$, one gets $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(1,q-2)} = 2$ from Lemma 2.2. In view of Lemma 2.1 (i) and (v), one has $k_{1,q-2} = 1$. Lemma 3.3 (iii) implies $\tilde{\partial}(x_{l-1}, z) = (2, q-1)$ and $l = q$. Pick vertices $x'_{l-2} \in P_{(q-1,1),(1,q-2)}(x_{l-1}, w)$ and $x'_1 \in P_{(1,q-2),(q-1,1)}(w, z)$. Note that $\tilde{\partial}(x'_{l-2}, x'_1) \neq (2, q-3)$. By $k_{1,q-2} = 1$, we obtain $l = q = 3$. In view of Lemma 3.3 (ii) and Theorem 3.4 (ii), we get $p = 4$, which implies that $(1, 3)$ is pure. Since $\tilde{\partial}(x_{l-1}, z) = (2, 2)$, there exists a vertex $x' \in P_{(1,3),(1,3)}(z, x_{l-1})$. Then (x_{l-1}, w, z, x') is a circuit containing arcs of types $(1, 2)$ and $(1, 3)$, a contradiction.

Case 1.2. $(t, q) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $t = q-1$.

Note that $q > 3$. Theorem 3.4 (ii) implies that $(1, q-2)$ is pure. Since $q-1 \notin \{2, q, p\}$, we have $\tilde{\partial}(x_{l-1}, z) \neq (2, q-3)$ and $|\Gamma_{1,q-2}^2| = 2$. In view of Lemma 2.1 (iii), we get $k_{1,q-2} = 2$, which implies $p_{(1,q-2),(1,q-2)}^{(2,q-3)} = 1$ from Lemma 3.2. By Lemma 2.2, $p_{(1,q-2),(1,q-2)}^{(2,l-1)} = 2$. In view of Lemma 2.1 (i) and (v), we obtain $k_{2,l-1} = 1$.

Since $k_{1,q-2} = 2$ and $(q, p) \notin \mathcal{D}$, by Lemma 4.1, we have $(q-1, p) \notin \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}$. It follows from $\partial(w, x_{l-2}) < l$ and Theorem 3.4 (i) that $h_{l-2} \neq p$. Hence, $h_i \neq p$ for $0 \leq i \leq l-2$. In view of Step 2, we get $|\{j \mid h_j = q\}| < 2$. By Step 1, one has $h_{l-1} = p$.

Since $\partial(x_1, x) < l$ and $(q-1, p) \notin \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}$, we have $\tilde{\partial}(y', x_1) \neq (1, q-2)$ from Theorem 3.4 (i). In view of Theorem 3.4 (ii), we get $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(1,q-2)} \neq 0$ and $|\Gamma_{1,q-1}^2| = 2$. Lemma 2.1 (iii) implies $k_{1,q-1} = 2$. Since $k_{1,q-2} = 2$, by Lemma 2.1 (i) and (v), we get $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(1,q-2)} = 1$. It follows from Lemma 2.2 that there exists a vertex $z' \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}(y', x_1) \setminus \{z\}$. In view of Theorem 3.4 (i), we obtain $z' \in \Gamma_{2,l}(x)$ and $\Gamma_{1,p-1}\Gamma_{1,q-1} = \{\Gamma_{2,l}\}$. Since $x \in P_{(1,p-1),(2,l)}(x_{l-1}, z)$ and $k_{2,l-1} = 1$, we obtain $k_{1,p-1} = 2$ from Lemma 2.1 (i). Hence, $p_{(1,p-1),(1,q-1)}^{(2,l)} = 2$ and there exists a vertex $y'' \in P_{(1,p-1),(1,q-1)}(x, z)$ such that $\tilde{\partial}(y'', x_1) = (1, q-2)$. By Theorem 3.4 (i), one has $\partial(x, x_1) = 2$, contrary to $\partial(x_1, x) < l$.

Case 1.3. $(t, q) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $t = q + 1$.

Since $(1, q)$ is mixed, $(1, q-1)$ is pure and $p_{(1,q),(1,q)}^{(1,q-1)} \neq 0$ from Theorem 3.4 (ii). The fact that $\partial(x_{l-1}, z) = 2$ implies $|\Gamma_{1,q}^2| = 2$. In view of Lemma 2.1 (iii), $k_{1,q} = 2$. If $p_{(1,q),(1,q)}^{(2,l-1)} = 2$, then there exists a vertex $w' \in P_{(1,q),(1,q)}(x_{l-1}, z)$ such that $\tilde{\partial}(y', w') = (1, q)$; if $p_{(1,q),(1,q)}^{(2,l-1)} = 1$, by Lemma 2.2, then $p_{(1,q),(1,q)}^{(1,q-1)} = 2$ and $\tilde{\partial}(y', w) = (1, q)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $\tilde{\partial}(y', w) = (1, q)$.

By Theorem 3.4 (i), we have $\partial(x, w) = 2$. Since $k_{1,q} = 2$ and $C_{q,p}$ does not exist, we obtain $(q+1, p) \notin \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}$ from Lemma 4.1. It follows that $l \leq \partial(w, x) \leq \partial(w, x_{l-1}) + 1 = q + 1$. In view of Lemma 3.3 (i), one gets $l-1 = \partial(z, x_{l-1}) > q-1$. Then $\partial(w, x) = l$. Since $x \in P_{(l,2),(2,l)}(w, z)$, by Lemma 2.2, one has $q = 1$, a contradiction.

Case 1.4. $(t, q) \in \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}$.

Suppose that $(1, t-1)$ is pure. By Lemma 4.1, $k_{1,t-1} = 1$ or $\Delta_t \simeq \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_{2t}, \{1, t+1\})$, which implies $\tilde{\partial}(x_{l-1}, z) = (2, t-2)$. Hence, $t = p$, a contradiction.

Suppose that $(1, t-1)$ is mixed. It follows from Lemma 4.1 that $k_{1,t-1} = 1$ or $C_{t-1,q}$ exists. If $k_{1,t-1} = 1$, by Theorem 3.4 (ii), then $\partial(x_{l-1}, z) = 1$, a contradiction; if $C_{t-1,q}$ exists, by Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.6 (ii), then $\partial(x_{l-1}, z) = 1$, a contradiction.

Case 2. $(s, t) \in \mathcal{B}$.

Note that $(1, s-1)$ is mixed and $s = t + 1$. By Theorem 3.4 (ii), $(1, t-1)$ is pure. Since $\partial(x_1, w) < l$, from Theorem 3.4 (i), one has $t = q$ or $(t, q) \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}$.

Case 2.1. $t = q$.

Note that $s = q + 1$ and $l-1 = \partial(z, x_{l-1}) \geq q-1$. Since $(1, q)$ is mixed, by Theorem 3.4 (ii), one has $p_{(1,q),(1,q)}^{(1,q-1)} \neq 0$. Pick a vertex $x'_{l-2} \in P_{(q,1),(1,q-1)}(x_{l-1}, w)$. The fact that $q+1 \notin \{2, q, p\}$ implies $\tilde{\partial}(x'_{l-2}, z) \neq (2, q-2)$ and $|\Gamma_{1,q-1}^2| = 2$. By Lemma 2.1 (iii), $k_{1,q-1} = 2$. In view of Lemma 3.2, we get $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(2,q-2)} = 1$. Since $\tilde{\partial}(x'_{l-2}, z) \neq (2, q-2)$, we obtain $\tilde{\partial}(x'_{l-2}, y') = (1, q-1)$ from Lemma 2.2.

In view of $p_{(1,q),(1,q)}^{(1,q-1)} \neq 0$ and $k_{1,q-1} = 2$, by Lemma 2.1 (i), we obtain $k_{1,q} = 2$. Since $C_{q,p}$ does not exist, $(q+1, p) \notin \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}$ from Lemma 4.1. Since $x \in$

$P_{(1,h_{l-1}-1),(1,p-1)}(x_{l-1}, y')$, there exists a vertex $x' \in P_{(1,p-1),(1,h_{l-1}-1)}(x_{l-1}, y')$. In view of Theorem 3.4 (i), we have $\partial(x'_{l-2}, x') = 2$. Since $q \leq l$ and $l \leq \partial(x', x'_{l-2}) \leq 1 + \partial(y', x'_{l-2}) = q$, we get $\tilde{\partial}(x'_{l-2}, x') = (2, l)$.

Suppose $w = y'$. Since $x \in P_{(1,h_{l-1}-1),(1,p-1)}(x_{l-1}, w)$ and $p \neq q+1$, by Theorem 3.4 (i), we have $h_{l-1} = p$. Theorem 3.4 (ii) and (iii) imply that $(1, q)$ is pure, a contradiction. Suppose $w \neq y'$. By $p_{(1,q-1),(1,p-1)}^{(2,l)} \neq 0$ and $p > 2$, we get $w \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,p-1)}(x'_{l-2}, x')$. Since $x' \in P_{(1,p-1),(p-1,1)}(x_{l-1}, w)$, from Lemma 2.2, we obtain $q = 1$, a contradiction.

Case 2.2. $(t, q) \in \mathcal{B}$.

Note that $t = q - 1$ and $s = q$. By Theorem 3.4 (ii), we have $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(1,q-2)} \neq 0$.

Case 2.2.1. $k_{1,q-2} = 1$.

Since $\partial(z, x_{l-1}) \geq q - 2$, $l \geq q - 1$. Pick a vertex $x'_{l-2} \in P_{(q-1,1),(1,q-2)}(x_{l-1}, w)$. The fact that $(1, q - 2)$ is pure implies that $\tilde{\partial}(x'_{l-2}, z) = (2, q - 3)$ and $l = q - 1$, contrary to $q - 1 \notin \{2, q, p\}$.

Case 2.2.2. $k_{1,q-2} = 2$.

Since $\partial(w, x_{l-2}) < l$, one gets $h_{l-2} \neq p$ from Theorem 3.4 (i). Then $h_j \neq p$ for $0 \leq j \leq l - 2$. Step 2 implies $|\{i \mid h_i = q\}| < 2$. It follows from Step 1 that $h_{l-1} = p$ and $h_j = 2$ for $1 \leq j \leq l - 2$.

Since $(q, p) \notin \mathcal{D}$ and $(1, q - 2)$ is pure, by Lemma 4.1, one has $(q - 1, p) \notin \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}$. In view of $w \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-2)}(x_{l-1}, z)$, there exists a vertex $w' \in P_{(1,q-2),(1,q-1)}(x_{l-1}, z)$. It follows from Theorem 3.4 (iii) that $w' \neq y'$. Observe $\partial(x_1, x) < l$. Theorem 3.4 (i) implies $\tilde{\partial}(y', x_1) \neq (1, q - 2)$ and $\tilde{\partial}(w', x_1) = (1, q - 2)$. Since $(1, q - 2)$ is pure, by Lemma 2.3, we have $\tilde{\partial}(x_{l-1}, x_1) = (2, 2)$ and $l = q = 4$. In view of $\partial(x_2, w') \leq 2$ and Lemma 4.5 (i), we obtain $\partial(w', x_2) = 1$. Then (x_2, x_3, w') is a circuit containing arcs of types $(1, 1)$ and $(1, 2)$, a contradiction.

Case 2.3. $(t, q) \in \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}$.

Observe that $(1, t - 1)$ is pure and $(1, t)$ is mixed. By Lemma 4.1, we have $k_{1,t-1} = 1$ or $\Delta_t \simeq \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_{2t}, \{1, t + 1\})$. It follows from Theorem 3.4 (ii) that $p_{(1,t),(1,t)}^{(1,t-1)} \neq 0$. Pick a vertex $x'_{l-2} \in P_{(t,1),(1,t-1)}(x_{l-1}, w)$. In view of $k_{1,t-1} = 1$ or Lemma 3.2 (i), one gets $\tilde{\partial}(x'_{l-2}, z) = (2, t - 2)$. Note that $l - 1 = \partial(z, x_{l-1}) \geq t - 1$. Hence, $l = t$. Since $(1, t - 1)$ is pure, we obtain $t = p$, contrary to $(q, p) \notin \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}$.

We finish the proof of Step 4.

Step 5 Show that $(1, s - 1)$ is pure if $\partial(x_{l-1}, z) = 2$.

Suppose for the contrary that $(1, s - 1)$ is mixed. By Theorem 3.4 (ii), we have $p_{(1,s-1),(1,s-1)}^{(1,s-2)} \neq 0$ and $(1, s - 2)$ is pure. Pick vertices $w \in P_{(1,s-1),(1,1)}(x_{l-1}, z)$ and $x'_{l-2} \in P_{(s-1,1),(1,s-2)}(x_{l-1}, w)$.

Case 1. $s > 3$.

By Lemma 3.3 (ii), we have $\partial(z, x_{l-1}) \neq s - 2$. Since $(q, p) \notin \mathcal{B}$, one gets $\{s - 1, s\} \neq \{q, p\}$. It follows from Lemma 4.5 (ii) that $\tilde{\partial}(x_{l-1}, z) = (2, s - 1)$ and $l = s$. Since $(1, s - 2)$ is pure, by Theorem 3.4 (i), we obtain $\partial(x'_{l-2}, z) = 2$. From Lemma 4.5 (i), we obtain $\tilde{\partial}(x'_{l-2}, z) = (2, s - 1)$. Since $z \in P_{(2,s-1),(s-1,2)}(x'_{l-2}, x_{l-1})$, by Lemma 2.2, one has $s = 2$, a contradiction.

Case 2. $s = 3$.

Note that $l \leq 4$ and $x'_{l-2} \neq z$. Then $k_{1,1} = 2$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $p \neq 3$. By Lemma 3.3 (ii) and Theorem 3.4 (ii), we have $p = 4$ or 5 .

Suppose $p = 4$. Theorem 3.4 (ii) implies that $(1, 3)$ is pure. It follows from Lemma 3.1 that $\tilde{\partial}(x'_{l-2}, z) = (1, 1)$. Since $\partial(x'_{l-2}, y) \leq 3$, by Theorem 3.4 (i) and Lemma 4.5 (i), we get $\tilde{\partial}(y, x'_{l-2}) = (1, 3)$. Then $\partial(x, x'_{l-2}) = 2$, contrary to $l \geq 3$.

Suppose $p = 5$. By Lemma 3.3 (ii) and Theorem 3.4 (ii), one has $l = 4$. Since $\partial(w, x) \leq 3$, we obtain $\partial(y, w) = 2$ from Theorem 3.4 (i). From $\partial(w, y) \leq 4$ and Lemma 4.5 (i), $(1, 4)$ is mixed. In view of Theorem 3.4 (ii), $(1, 3)$ is pure. By Lemma 3.1, we get $\tilde{\partial}(x'_{l-2}, z) = (1, 1)$, contrary to $l = 4$.

Step 6 Show that $\{h_{l-1}, s\} = \{q, p\}$ if $\partial(x_{l-1}, z) = 2$.

By Step 5, $(1, s-1)$ is pure. From Step 4 and Lemma 4.5 (i), we get $\tilde{\partial}(x_{l-1}, z) = (2, s)$ and $l = s+1$, which imply $s \in \{q, p\}$. Pick a vertex $w \in P_{(1, s-1), (1, 1)}(x_{l-1}, z)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $s = q$.

Suppose $h_{l-1} = 2$. Observe that $\tilde{\partial}(x_{l-1}, z) = (2, q) = (2, l-1)$. By Theorem 3.4 (i), one gets $\partial(x_{l-1}, y) = 2$. In view of Lemma 4.5 (i), we have $\tilde{\partial}(x_{l-1}, y) = (2, q)$. From Lemma 2.2, we obtain $p = 2$, a contradiction. Hence, $h_{l-1} \in \{q, p\}$.

Suppose $h_{l-1} = s$. Since $l \geq 3$, one gets $w \neq x$ and $k_{1, q-1} = 2$. By Lemma 2.2 and $x_{l-1} \in P_{(q-1, 1), (1, q-1)}(x, w)$, we have $\partial(x, w) = \partial(w, x)$. In view of $z \in P_{(2, l), (1, 1)}(x, w)$, there exists $z' \in P_{(1, 1), (2, l)}(w, x)$. Since $l \geq 3$, we get $z' \neq z$ and $k_{1, 1} = 2$. By $\tilde{\partial}(w, x) \neq (1, 1)$, we obtain $p_{(1, q-1), (q-1, 1)}^{(1, 1)} = 0$. It follows from Theorem 3.4 (i) and Lemma 4.5 (i) that $A_{1, q-1}A_{1, 1} = 2A_{2, q}$. Then $\tilde{\partial}(x, z) = (1, 1)$, a contradiction. Thus, $h_{l-1} = p$.

Step 7 For $a, b \in \{2, q, p\}$ and $a < b$, show that $p_{(1, b-1), (2, l)}^{(3, l-1)} \neq 0$ if $p_{(1, a-1), (2, l)}^{(3, l-1)} = 0$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume $b = q$. We claim that $h_i = q$ for some $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, l-1\}$. Assume the contrary, namely, $h_i \neq q$ for each i . Suppose $a = 2$. By Step 1, we may assume $h_{l-1} = 2$. It follows from Steps 3, 4 and 6 that $\tilde{\partial}(x_{l-1}, z) = (3, l-1)$, contrary to $p_{(1, 1), (2, l)}^{(3, l-1)} = 0$. Suppose $a = p$. By Step 1, we may assume $h_{l-2} = h_{l-1} = p$. It follows from Steps 3, 4 and 6 that $\partial(x_{l-1}, z) = 2$ and there exists a vertex $w \in P_{(1, q-1), (1, 1)}(x_{l-1}, z)$. Theorem 3.4 (i) implies $\partial(x_{l-2}, w) = 2$, contrary to $\partial(w, x_{l-2}) < l$. So our claim is valid.

Without loss of generality, we may assume $h_{l-1} = q$. It suffices to show that $\partial(x_{l-1}, z) = 3$.

Suppose $\partial(x_{l-1}, z) = 2$. It follows from Steps 4–6 that $(1, p-1)$ is pure and there exists a vertex $w' \in P_{(1, 1), (1, p-1)}(x_{l-1}, z)$. By Lemma 4.5 (i), we have $\tilde{\partial}(x_{l-1}, z) = (2, p)$ and $l = p+1$. Let $(y_0 = z, y_1, \dots, y_{l-2} = w')$ be a path consisting of arcs of type $(1, p-1)$. Since $x_{l-1} \in P_{(1, 1), (1, q-1)}(w', x)$, there exists $x'_{l-1} \in P_{(1, q-1), (1, 1)}(w', x)$. Note that $(z = y_0, y_1, \dots, y_{l-2}, x'_{l-1}, x)$ is a shortest path. Then $\tilde{\partial}(y_{l-3}, x'_{l-1}) = (2, l)$. Hence, $\tilde{\partial}(x, y_1) = \tilde{\partial}(x'_{l-1}, z) = (3, l-1)$, contrary to $a \in \{2, p\}$. By Step 3, we obtain $\partial(x_{l-1}, z) = 3$, as desired.

Based on the above discussion, we consider two cases, and reach a contradiction, respectively.

Case 1. $p_{(2, l), (1, 1)}^{(3, l-1)} \neq 0$.

Pick a vertex $y_1 \in P_{(3,l-1),(1,1)}(x, z)$. By Step 7, we may assume $p_{(1,q-1),(2,l)}^{(3,l-1)} \neq 0$. Then there exist vertices $z' \in P_{(2,l),(1,q-1)}(x, y_1)$ and $y'_1 \in P_{(1,p-1),(1,q-1)}(x, z')$. It follows that $k_{2,l} = 2$. Observe that $x \in P_{(l,2),(2,l)}(z, z')$. By Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3, we get $\tilde{\partial}(z', z) = (2, 2)$. Lemma 3.3 (ii) and Theorem 3.4 (ii) imply $q = 3$.

By Lemma 4.5 (i), $(1, 2)$ is mixed, which implies $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(1,1)} \neq 0$ from Theorem 3.4 (ii). Since $\partial(y'_1, y_1) = 2$, we have $|\Gamma_{1,2}^2| = 2$. In view of Lemma 2.1 (iii), we obtain $k_{1,2} = 2$. Since $\tilde{\partial}(z, z') = (2, 2)$, $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(1,1)} = 1$. By Lemma 2.2, there exists a vertex $z'' \in P_{(1,2),(1,2)}(y'_1, y_1) \setminus \{z'\}$. In view of Theorem 3.4 (i), we get $z'' \in \Gamma_{2,l}(x)$. Since $k_{2,l} = 2$, we obtain $z'' = z$, a contradiction.

Case 2. $p_{(2,l),(1,1)}^{(3,l-1)} = 0$.

We claim that any shortest path from z to x does not contain an edge. Suppose for the contrary that $h_{l-1} = 2$. It follows from Step 3, 4 and 6 that $\partial(x_{l-1}, z) = 3$, contrary to $p_{(2,l),(1,1)}^{(3,l-1)} = 0$. Thus, the claim is valid. By Step 7, we have $p_{(1,q-1),(2,l)}^{(3,l-1)} \neq 0$ and $p_{(1,p-1),(2,l)}^{(3,l-1)} \neq 0$. Pick a vertex $y_{l-1} \in P_{(q-1,1),(3,l-1)}(x, z)$. It follows that there exist vertices $x' \in P_{(1,p-1),(2,l)}(y_{l-1}, z)$ and $y'' \in P_{(1,p-1),(1,q-1)}(x', z)$. Then $k_{2,l} = 2$. From Lemma 2.1 (i), one gets $k_{1,q-1} = 2$ or $k_{1,p-1} = 2$.

Case 2.1. $k_{1,q-1} = 2$ and $k_{1,p-1} = 2$.

In view of the claim and Step 1, there exists a vertex z_1 such that $\tilde{\partial}(z, z_1) = (1, p-1)$ and $\partial(z_1, y_{l-1}) = l-2$. By Theorem 3.4 (i), if $y' = y''$, then $x, x' \in \Gamma_{l,2}(z)$; if $y' \neq y''$, then $y', y'' \in \Gamma_{l,2}(z_1)$. Hence, $A_{1,q-1}A_{1,p-1} = 2A_{2,l}$ and $\tilde{\partial}(x', y) = (1, q-1)$. Thus, $\tilde{\partial}(y_{l-1}, y) = (2, l)$ and $\tilde{\partial}(x, y) = (1, p-1)$, a contradiction.

Case 2.2. $k_{1,q-1} = 1$ or $k_{1,p-1} = 1$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume $k_{1,q-1} = 1$. Then $y' = y''$ and $k_{1,p-1} = 2$. It follows from Theorem 3.4 (i) that $\partial(y_{l-1}, y') = (2, l)$. Since $x' \in P_{(1,p-1),(1,p-1)}(y_{l-1}, y')$, one gets $p_{(1,p-1),(1,p-1)}^{(2,l)} = 1$ and there exists a vertex $y_0 \in P_{(1,p-1),(1,p-1)}(x, z)$. By Lemma 2.1 (i) and $k_{2,l} = 2$, we have $|\Gamma_{1,p-1}^2| = 2$. In view of Theorem 3.4 (i), we get $y_0 \in \Gamma_{2,l}(y_{l-1})$. Then $\tilde{\partial}(x', y_0) \neq (1, p-1)$. Since $p_{(1,p-1),(1,p-1)}^{(2,l)} = 1$, we obtain $y \in P_{(1,p-1),(1,p-1)}(x', z)$ and $\tilde{\partial}(y_{l-1}, y) \neq (2, l)$. By $\partial(y_{l-1}, y) = 2$ and Theorem 3.4 (ii), $(1, p-1)$ is pure, which implies $l > p-2$. Then $\tilde{\partial}(y_{l-1}, y) = (2, p-2)$, contrary to $x \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}(y_{l-1}, y)$.

Thus, we complete the proof of Theorem 5.1 under this assumption.

6 Subdigraphs

In this section, we focus on the existence of some special subdigraphs of commutative quasi-thin weakly distance-regular digraphs.

Lemma 6.1 *Let $q > 2$ and $(1, 1) \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)$. If $(q, q+1) \in \mathcal{B}$, $k_{1,q-1} = 1$ and $k_{1,q} = 2$, then $p_{(1,q),(q,1)}^{(1,1)} \neq 0$.*

Proof. By Theorem 3.4 (ii) and Lemma 2.1 (v), $p_{(1,q),(1,q)}^{(1,q-1)} = 2$ and $(1, q-1)$ is pure. Let x, y, z be vertices such that $\tilde{\partial}(x, y) = (1, 1)$ and $\tilde{\partial}(y, z) = (1, q-1)$. Since

$k_{1,q-1} = 1$, by Theorem 3.4 (i) and Lemma 4.5 (i), one gets $\tilde{\partial}(x, z) = (2, q)$. It follows from Lemma 2.1 (i) and (iii) that $|\Gamma_{1,q}^2| = 2$. In view of Lemma 3.3 (iii), one gets $p_{(1,q),(1,q)}^{(2,q)} \neq 0$, which implies that there exists a vertex $y' \in P_{(1,q),(1,q)}(x, z)$. Since $p_{(1,q),(1,q)}^{(1,q-1)} = 2$, we obtain $\tilde{\partial}(y, y') = (1, q)$. Thus, the desired result holds. $\square$

Proposition 6.2 *Suppose that the valency of Γ is more than 3. If $q > 2$, $k_{1,q-1} = 2$ and $(1, q-1)$ is pure, then $\Delta_q \simeq \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_{2q}, \{1, q+1\})$.*

Proof. Suppose not. By Lemma 3.2, there exists an isomorphism τ from $\text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_q \times \mathbb{Z}_q, \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\})$ to Δ_q .

By Lemma 4.1 and Theorem 5.1, $C_{p,h}$ does not exist for any p and h . Hence, $\{r \mid (1, r-1) \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)\} \subseteq \{2, q, q+1\}$. If $(1, q) \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)$, then $(1, q)$ is mixed, which implies $p_{(1,q),(1,q)}^{(1,q-1)} \neq 0$ and $k_{1,q} = 2$ from Theorem 3.4 (ii) and Lemma 2.1 (i).

Step 1 Show that $\Gamma_{1,q-1}\Gamma_{1,1} = \{\Gamma_{2,q}\}$ if $(1, 1) \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)$.

Suppose $p_{(1,q-1),(q-1,1)}^{(1,1)} \neq 0$. Then $\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma(\tau(a, b), \tau(a+1, b-1)) = (1, 1)$ and $k_{1,1} = 2$. Observe that $\tau(1, 0) \in P_{(1,1),(1,q-1)}(\tau(0, 1), \tau(2, 0))$ and $(\tau(0, 1), \tau(2, 0)) \notin \Gamma_{1,q-1}$. In view of Theorem 3.4 (i) and Lemma 4.5 (i), we obtain $(\tau(0, 1), \tau(2, 0)) \in \Gamma_{2,q}$, contrary to the fact that $(\tau(2, 0), \tau(3, 0), \dots, \tau(0, 0), \tau(0, 1))$ is a path of length $q-1$. Thus, $p_{(1,q-1),(q-1,1)}^{(1,1)} = 0$. It follows that $\Gamma_{1,q-1}\Gamma_{1,1} = \{\Gamma_{2,q}\}$.

Step 2 Show that $\Gamma_{1,q}\Gamma_{1,1} = \{\Gamma_{2,q+1}\}$ if $(1, 1), (1, q) \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)$.

Let x, y, z, w be vertices such that $\tilde{\partial}(x, y) = (1, q)$, $\tilde{\partial}(y, z) = (1, 1)$ and $w \in P_{(q,1),(1,q-1)}(x, y)$. By Step 1, we obtain $\tilde{\partial}(w, z) = (2, q)$, which implies $k_{2,q} = 2$ from Lemma 2.1 (i) and $k_{1,q-1} = 2$. Suppose $\partial(x, z) = 1$. In view of Theorem 3.4 (i), one has $\tilde{\partial}(x, z) = (1, q)$ and $k_{1,q} = 2$. Since $x \in P_{(1,q),(1,q)}(w, z)$, we get $\Gamma_{1,q}^2 = \{\Gamma_{1,q-1}, \Gamma_{2,q}\}$. By Lemma 2.1 (i) and (v), we obtain $p_{(1,q),(1,q)}^{(1,q-1)} = 1$. It follows from Lemma 2.2 that $p_{(1,q),(1,q)}^{(2,q)} = 2$ and $k_{2,q} = 1$, a contradiction. Then $\partial(x, z) = 2$. Since $\tilde{\partial}(w, z) = (2, q)$, by Lemma 2.2, we have $\partial(z, x) \neq q$. In view of Lemma 3.3 (ii), $\partial(z, x) = q+1$. Thus, $\Gamma_{1,q}\Gamma_{1,1} = \{\Gamma_{2,q+1}\}$.

Step 3 Show that $A_{1,q-1}^2 = A_{2,q-2} + 2A_{2,2q-2}$.

In view of Lemma 3.2 (ii) and Theorem 3.4 (ii), we have $A_{1,q-1}^2 = A_{2,q-2} + p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(2,t)} A_{2,t}$ with $t \neq q-2$. By Lemma 2.2, one gets $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(2,t)} = 2$, which implies $k_{2,t} = 1$ from Lemma 2.1 (i) and (v). Let x, y, y', z be vertices such that $\tilde{\partial}(x, z) = (2, t)$ and $P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}(x, z) = \{y, y'\}$.

We claim that $\partial(x, x_1) = 3$ for any path $(z = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_t = x)$. Assume the contrary, namely, $\partial(x, x_1) = 1$ or 2 .

Case 1. $\partial(x, x_1) = 1$.

Since $x_1 \notin \{y, y'\}$, we have $\tilde{\partial}(x, x_1) = (1, 1)$ or $(1, q)$. If $\tilde{\partial}(x, x_1) = (1, 1)$, by Step 1, then $\tilde{\partial}(x_1, y) = (2, q)$, contrary to $q > 2$; if $\tilde{\partial}(x, x_1) = (1, q)$, by $p_{(1,q),(1,q)}^{(1,q-1)} \neq 0$, then y or $y' \in \Gamma_{1,q}(x_1)$, which implies that (y, z, x_1) or (y', z, x_1) is a circuit, contrary to $q > 2$.

Case 2. $\partial(x, x_1) = 2$.

Pick a vertex $w \in P_{(1, h-1), (1, l-1)}(x, x_1)$. Suppose $h = q$. Then $w \in \{y, y'\}$. By Theorem 3.4 (i) and (ii), we have $\tilde{\partial}(z, x_1) = (1, 1)$, and y or $y' \in \Gamma_{q-1, 1}(x_1)$, which imply $p_{(1, q-1), (1, 1)}^{(1, q-1)} \neq 0$, contrary to Step 1. Thus, $h \neq q$ and $l \neq q$.

Suppose $h = l = 2$. Then $k_{1, 1} = 2$. By Step 1, $y, y' \in \Gamma_{2, q}(w)$. It follows from Lemma 2.1 (i) that $p_{(1, 1), (1, q-1)}^{(2, q)} = 2$ and $y, y' \in \Gamma_{1, q-1}(x_1)$. Since $(1, q-1)$ is pure, we get $q = 3$ and $\tilde{\partial}(z, x_1) = (1, 2)$. Observe that $y, y' \in P_{(1, 2), (1, 2)}(x_1, z)$, contrary to $p_{(1, 2), (1, 2)}^{(2, 1)} = 1$.

Suppose $h = q+1$ or $l = q+1$. By $p_{(1, q), (1, q)}^{(1, q-1)} \neq 0$, we may assume that $h = q+1$ and $\tilde{\partial}(w, y) = (1, q)$. Since $\partial(y, x_1) \leq 2$, one gets $l = q+1$ from Step 2. The fact that $\tilde{\partial}(x, x_1) = (2, t-1)$ implies $\Gamma_{1, q}^2 = \{\Gamma_{1, q-1}, \Gamma_{2, t-1}\}$. Since $k_{1, q-1} = 2$, by Lemma 2.1 (i) and (v), we obtain $p_{(1, q), (1, q)}^{(1, q-1)} = 1$. It follows from Lemma 2.2 that $p_{(1, q), (1, q)}^{(2, t-1)} = 2$ and $k_{2, t-1} = 1$. Since $k_{2, t} = 1$, by Lemma 2.1 (i), one has $\tilde{\partial}(z, x_1) = (1, 1)$. In view of Step 1, $\tilde{\partial}(y, x_1) = (2, q)$. Since $w \in P_{(q, 1), (1, q)}(y, x_1)$, from Lemma 2.2, we get $q = 2$, a contradiction.

Thus, our claim is valid.

Suppose that the path $(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_t)$ contains arcs of different types. Without loss of generality, we may assume $\tilde{\partial}(z, x_1) = (1, u-1)$ and $\tilde{\partial}(x_1, x_2) = (1, v-1)$ with $u \neq v$. Pick a vertex $x'_1 \in P_{(1, v-1), (1, u-1)}(z, x_2)$. By the claim, we get $\tilde{\partial}(x, x_1) = \tilde{\partial}(x, x'_1) = (3, t-1)$. It follows from Lemma 2.1 (iv) that $k_{2, t} = 2$, a contradiction. Then the path $(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_t)$ consists of arcs of the same type.

Suppose $\tilde{\partial}(x_i, x_{i+1}) = (1, 1)$ for $0 \leq i \leq t-1$. By Lemma 2.3, $t = 2$. In view of Step 1, we get $\tilde{\partial}(y, x_1) = (2, q)$. Since $(x_1, x_2 = x, y)$ is a path, one has $q \leq 2$, a contradiction.

Suppose $\tilde{\partial}(x_i, x_{i+1}) = (1, q)$ for $0 \leq i \leq t-1$. Then $\partial(z, x_2) = 2$. By $p_{(1, q), (1, q)}^{(1, q-1)} \neq 0$ and Lemma 3.3 (i), we have $\partial(x_2, z) > q-1$, which implies $t \geq 3$. Since $|\Gamma_{1, q}^2| = 2$ and $k_{1, q-1} = 2$, one gets $p_{(1, q), (1, q)}^{(1, q-1)} = 1$ from Lemma 2.1 (i) and (v). In view of Lemma 2.2, there exists a vertex $x''_1 \in P_{(1, q), (1, q)}(z, x_2)$ such that $\tilde{\partial}(x''_1, x_3) = (1, q-1)$, a contradiction.

Hence, $\tilde{\partial}(x_i, x_{i+1}) = (1, q-1)$ for $0 \leq i \leq t-1$. Since $\Delta_q \simeq \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_q \times \mathbb{Z}_q, \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\})$, we have $t = 2q-2$.

In the following, we reach a contradiction based on the above discussion.

Suppose $q > 3$. Note that $\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma(\tau(a, b), \tau(a+1, b+1)) = (2, 2q-2)$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} &(\tau(1, 1), \tau(2, 1), \tau(3, 1), \dots, \tau(-1, 1), \tau(0, 1), \tau(0, 2), \dots, \tau(0, 0)), \\ &(\tau(1, 1), \tau(2, 1), \tau(2, 2), \dots, \tau(2, -1), \tau(2, 0), \tau(3, 0), \dots, \tau(0, 0)) \end{aligned}$$

are two shortest paths, we get $\tau(3, 1), \tau(2, 2) \in \Gamma_{4, 2q-4}(\tau(0, 0))$. But $\tau(1, 1) \in P_{(2, 2q-2), (2, q-2)}(\tau(0, 0), \tau(3, 1))$ and $P_{(2, 2q-2), (2, q-2)}(\tau(0, 0), \tau(2, 2)) = \emptyset$, a contradiction. In the following, we consider $q = 3$.

Case 1. $(1, 1) \in \partial(\Gamma)$.

By Step 3 and Lemma 2.1 (i), we have $k_{2, 4} = 1$. From Step 2, one gets $(1, 3) \notin \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)$, which implies $k_{1, 1} = 2$. Let x, y, z, z' be distinct vertices such that $\tilde{\partial}(x, y) =$

$(1, 2)$ and $\tilde{\partial}(y, z) = \tilde{\partial}(y, z') = (1, 1)$. By Step 1, we obtain $z, z' \in \Gamma_{2,3}(x)$. In view of Lemma 2.1 (i), one has $p_{(1,2),(1,1)}^{(2,3)} = 2$, which implies that there exists a vertex y' such that $\tilde{\partial}(x, y') = (1, 2)$ and $\tilde{\partial}(y', z) = \tilde{\partial}(y', z') = (1, 1)$ with $y' \neq y$. Hence, (y, z, y', z') is an undirected circuit of length 4. By Lemma 2.3, we get $\tilde{\partial}(y, y') = (2, 2)$ and $p_{(1,1),(1,1)}^{(2,2)} = 2$. From Lemma 2.1 (i) and (v), $k_{2,2} = 1$. Since $x \in P_{(2,1),(1,2)}(y, y')$, we have $p_{(2,1),(1,2)}^{(2,2)} = 2$, contrary to $\Delta_3 \simeq \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3, \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\})$.

Case 2. $(1, 1) \notin \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)$.

Note that $(1, 3) \in \partial(\Gamma)$. Pick a vertex $w \in P_{(1,3),(1,3)}(\tau(0, 0), \tau(0, 1))$.

Case 2.1. $|\Gamma_{1,3}^2| = 1$.

Since $k_{1,2} = 2$, by Lemma 2.1 (i), we have $p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(1,2)} = 2$ and $\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma(w, \tau(1, 0)) = (1, 3)$. Pick a vertex $x' \in P_{(1,3),(1,3)}(\tau(0, 0), \tau(1, 0))$ with $x' \neq w$. Observe $x' \in P_{(1,3),(1,3)}(\tau(0, 0), \tau(0, 1))$. Since $w, x' \in P_{(3,1),(1,3)}(\tau(0, 1), \tau(1, 0))$, from Lemma 2.1 (i) and (v), we obtain $k_{\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma(\tau(0,1), \tau(1,0))} = 1$ and $|P_{(1,2),(2,1)}(\tau(0, 1), \tau(1, 0))| = 2$, contrary to $\Delta_3 \simeq \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3, \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\})$.

Case 2.2. $|\Gamma_{1,3}^2| = 2$.

Since $|\Gamma_{1,3}^2| = 2$, one has $(w, \tau(1, 0)) \notin \Gamma_{1,3}$, which implies $P_{(1,2),(1,3)}(w, \tau(1, 1)) = \{\tau(0, 1)\}$. By Lemma 2.1 (i), $|\Gamma_{1,2}\Gamma_{1,3}| = 2$. It follows from Theorem 3.4 (i) that $\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma(w, \tau(0, 2)) = (2, 2)$ and $\partial_\Gamma(w, \tau(1, 1)) = 2$. By Step 3, we get $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,4)} = 2$. Hence, $\partial_\Gamma(\tau(1, 1), w) = 3$ or 5.

Case 2.2.1. $\partial_\Gamma(\tau(1, 1), w) = 3$.

Pick a path $(\tau(1, 1), z_1, z_2, w)$. Suppose that $(z_2, w) \in \Gamma_{1,3}$. The fact that $\partial_\Gamma(\tau(1, 1), \tau(0, 0)) = 4$ implies $z_2 \neq \tau(0, 0)$. Since $|\Gamma_{1,3}^2| = 2$, from Theorem 3.4 (ii), (iii) and Lemma 3.3 (i), we get $(z_2, \tau(0, 1)) \in \Gamma_{2,3}$, which implies $\Gamma_{1,3}^2 = \{\Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{2,3}\}$. Since $k_{1,2} = 2$, by Lemma 2.1 (i) and (v), we obtain $p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(1,2)} = 1$. In view of Lemma 2.2, one has $p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(2,3)} = 2$ and $\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma(\tau(0, 1), \tau(1, 1)) = (1, 3)$, a contradiction.

Note that the path $(\tau(1, 1), z_1, z_2, w)$ consists of arcs of type $(1, 2)$. In view of $(\tau(0, 1), \tau(1, 2)), (\tau(1, 1), \tau(2, 2)) \in \Gamma_{2,4}$, we have $z_1 = \tau(2, 1)$ and $z_2 = \tau(0, 1)$, a contradiction.

Case 2.2.2. $\partial_\Gamma(\tau(1, 1), w) = 5$.

By $\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma(w, \tau(0, 2)) = (2, 2)$, we obtain $\Gamma_{1,2}\Gamma_{1,3} = \{\Gamma_{2,2}, \Gamma_{2,5}\}$, which implies $\tau(2, 0) \in P_{(2,1),(2,5)}(\tau(0, 0), w)$. Since $(\tau(1, 1), \tau(1, 2), \tau(2, 2), \tau(2, 0), \tau(0, 0), w)$ and $(\tau(1, 1), \tau(2, 1), \tau(2, 2), \tau(2, 0), \tau(0, 0), w)$ are two shortest paths, $\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma(w, \tau(1, 2)) = \partial_\Gamma(w, \tau(2, 1)) = (3, 4)$. It follows from Step 3 and Lemma 2.1 (i) that $k_{2,4} = 1$. Since $\tau(0, 1) \in P_{(1,3),(2,4)}(w, \tau(1, 2))$, we get $\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma(w, \tau(1, 0)) = (1, 3)$, contrary to $|\Gamma_{1,3}^2| = 2$.

This completes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

Proposition 6.3 *Let $q > 2$, $k_{1,q-1} = 2$ and $(1, q-1)$ be pure. The following hold:*

- (i) *If $(1, q)$ is mixed, then $\Delta_{q,q+1} \simeq \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_{4q}, \{1, 2, 2q+1, 2q+2\})$.*
- (ii) *If $k_{1,1} = 2$, then $\Delta_{2,q} \simeq \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_q \times \mathbb{Z}_4, \{(1, 0), (1, 2), (0, 1), (0, 3)\})$ for $q \neq 4$.*

Proof. Assume that $l = q+1$ and $(1, q)$ is mixed, or $l = 2$ and $k_{1,1} = 2$. In view of Theorem 3.4 (ii) and Lemma 2.1 (i), we have $k_{1,l-1} = 2$. By Proposition 6.2, there

exists an isomorphism τ from $\text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_{2q}, \{1, q+1\})$ to $\Delta_q(x)$ for fixed $x \in V\Gamma$. Write $\tau(a) = (a, 0)$ for any a . Suppose that there exists a vertex $(s, 0) \in \Gamma_{1, l-1}(0, 0)$. By Lemma 3.2 (i), we have $s = q$. Since $(1, 0), (q+1, 0) \in P_{(1, q-1), (q-1, 1)}((0, 0), (q, 0))$, from Lemma 2.2, one gets $l = 2$. In view of Lemma 2.1 (i) and (v), we obtain $k_{1,1} = 1$, a contradiction. Hence, $\Gamma_{1, l-1} \notin \langle \Gamma_{1, q-1} \rangle$.

If $l = q+1$, by Lemma 4.6 (ii), then $A_{1, q}^2 = 2A_{1, q-1}$; if $l = 2$, by Lemma 4.6 (i) and Lemma 2.1 (i), then $A_{1, q-1}A_{1,1} = 2A_{2, q}$. Then $V\Delta_{l, q}(x)$ has a partition $F_q(x) \dot{\cup} F_q(x')$. Let σ be an isomorphism from $\Delta_q(x)$ to $\Delta_q(x')$ such that $\sigma(0, 0) \in \Gamma_{1, l-1}(0, 0)$. Write $\sigma(a, 0) = (a, 1)$ for each a . Suppose $l = q+1$. Since $A_{1, q}^2 = 2A_{1, q-1}$, we have $(a, 1), (a+q, 1) \in \Gamma_{1, q}(a, 0)$ and $(a+1, 0), (a+q+1, 0) \in \Gamma_{1, q}(a, 1)$, which imply that (i) holds. Suppose $l = 2$. Since $A_{1, q-1}A_{1,1} = 2A_{2, q}$, one gets $(a, 1), (a+q, 1) \in \Gamma_{1,1}(a, 0)$. If $q = 4$, by Lemma 2.3, then $(4, 0), (2, 0), (6, 0) \in \Gamma_{2,2}(0, 0)$ since $(1, 3)$ is pure, a contradiction. Thus, (ii) holds. $\square$

Proposition 6.4 *Let $k_{1,1} = 2$, $k_{1, q-1} = 1$ and $(1, q-1)$ be pure. Then $\Delta_{2, q} \simeq \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_q \times \mathbb{Z}_n, \{(1, 0), (0, 1), (0, -1)\})$. In particular, if $(1, q)$ is mixed, then $n \leq q - (1 + (-1)^q)/2$ and $\Gamma_{1, q} \notin \langle \{\Gamma_{1,1}, \Gamma_{1, q-1}\} \rangle$.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.3, we get $\Gamma_{1, q-1} \notin \langle \Gamma_{1,1} \rangle$. For fixed $x_0 \in V\Gamma$, $V\Delta_{2, q}(x_0)$ has a partition $\dot{\cup}_{i=0}^{m-1} F_2(x_i)$ with $m > 1$. Let τ be an isomorphism from $\text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_n, \{1, n-1\})$ to $\Delta_2(x_0)$. Write $\tau(a) = (0, a)$ for each a . Since $k_{1, q-1} = 1$, $\sigma_j : F_2(x_j) \rightarrow F_2(x_{j+1})$, $y_j \mapsto y_{j+1}$ is an isomorphism from $\Delta_2(x_j)$ to $\Delta_2(x_{j+1})$, where $y_{j+1} \in \Gamma_{1, q-1}(y_j)$ for $0 \leq j \leq m-2$. Write $\sigma_j(j, a) = (j+1, a)$.

Assume that $(s, t) \in \Gamma_{1, q-1}(m-1, 0)$. Since $k_{1, q-1} = 1$, we have $s = 0$. It follows from Lemma 2.1 (i) and Lemma 2.3 that $t = 0$, or $2 \mid n$ and $t = n/2$.

Suppose $2 \mid n$ and $t = n/2$. Since $(1, q-1)$ is pure and $k_{1, q-1} = 1$, from Lemma 2.1 (i), we get $\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma((0, 0), (0, n/2)) = (m, q-m)$, which implies $q = 2m$ from Lemma 2.3. Hence, $q \leq n$ and $(0, 0) \in \Gamma_{1, q-1}(m-1, n/2)$. By $k_{1,1} = 2$ and Lemma 4.7 (i), $C_{p, h}$ does not exist for any p and h . It follows from Theorem 5.1 that $\{r \mid (1, r-1) \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)\} \subseteq \{2, q, q+1\}$. Then $(0, m), (0, -m) \in \Gamma_{m, m}(0, 0)$. Since $k_{m, m} \leq 2$, we obtain $m = n/2$ and $n = q$. Hence, $((0, 0), (1, 0), \dots, (m-1, 0), (0, n/2), (0, n/2-1), \dots, (0, 1))$ is a circuit of length q containing arcs of types $(1, 1)$ and $(1, q-1)$, contrary to the fact that $(1, q-1)$ is pure. Then $t = 0$ and $m = q$. Since $(1, q-1)$ is pure, one has $((m-1, a), (0, a)) \in \Gamma_{1, q-1}$ for each a . Thus, $\Delta_{2, q} \simeq \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_q \times \mathbb{Z}_n, \{(1, 0), (0, 1), (0, -1)\})$.

In the following, we assume that $(1, q)$ is mixed. By Theorem 3.4 (ii) and Lemma 2.1 (ii), $p_{(1, q), (1, q)}^{(1, q-1)} = k_{1, q}$. Note that $\{r \mid (1, r-1) \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)\} = \{2, q, q+1\}$.

First, we prove $n \leq q - (1 + (-1)^q)/2$ by way of contradiction. Assume that $n > q - (1 + (-1)^q)/2$. Suppose that q is even. Since $(1, q-1)$ is pure and $k_{1, q-1} = 1$, by Lemma 2.1 (i), we get $\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma((0, 0), (q/2, 0)) = (q/2, q/2)$ and $k_{q/2, q/2} = 1$. Observe $\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma((0, 0), (0, q/2)) = (q/2, q/2)$, a contradiction. Suppose that q is odd. Pick a vertex $x \in P_{(1, q), (1, q)}(((q-1)/2, 0), ((q+1)/2, 0))$. Note that $x, (0, (q+1)/2) \in \Gamma_{(q+1)/2, (q+1)/2}(0, 0)$. Since $(x, ((q+1)/2, 0), ((q+3)/2, 0), \dots, (0, 0))$ is a path containing arcs of types $(1, q-1)$ and $(1, q)$, there exists a path $((0, (q+1)/2) = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{(q+1)/2} = (0, 0))$ containing arcs of types $(1, q-1)$ and $(1, q)$. Then

$((0,0), (0,1), \dots, (0, (q+1)/2) = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{(q-1)/2})$ is a circuit of length $q+1$ containing arcs of types $(1,1)$, $(1, q-1)$ and $(1, q)$, contrary to Lemma 3.3 (ii).

Suppose that $(h, l) \in \Gamma_{1,q}(0,0)$ for some $h \in \{0, 1, \dots, q-1\}$ and $l \in \mathbb{Z}_n$. By Lemma 2.3, $h \neq 0$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $2\hat{l} \leq n$. The fact that $p_{(1,q),(1,q)}^{(1,q-1)} = k_{1,q}$ implies $\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma((h,l), (1,0)) = (1,q)$. Since $((0,0), (h,l), (h+1,l), \dots, (0,l), (0,l-1), \dots, (0,1))$ and $((1,0), (2,0), \dots, (h,0), (h,1), \dots, (h,l))$ are two circuits, one has $q-h+\hat{l}+1 \geq q+1$ and $h+\hat{l} \geq q+1$. Hence, $q+1 \leq 2\hat{l} \leq n$, contrary to $n \leq q - (1 + (-1)^q)/2$. Thus, $\Gamma_{1,q} \notin \langle \{\Gamma_{1,1}, \Gamma_{1,q-1}\} \rangle$. $\square$

7 The proof of Theorem 1.1

First, we prove our main result under the assumption that $C_{q,h}$ exists for some q and h .

Lemma 7.1 *If $C_{q,h}$ exists for some q and h , then Γ is isomorphic to one of the following digraphs:*

- (i) *The digraphs in Theorem 1.1 (iv) for $i = 0$.*
- (ii) *The digraphs in Theorem 1.1 (vii).*

Proof. By Lemma 4.1, $k_{1,q-1} = 2$ and $k_{1,h-1} = 1$. Suppose $(1, p-1) \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)$ with $p \notin \{q, h\}$. From Theorem 5.1 and Lemma 4.8, we have $p = 2$ or $(q, p) \in \mathcal{B}$. If $p = 2$, by Lemma 4.7 (i), then $k_{1,1} = 1$; if $(q, p) \in \mathcal{B}$, by Lemma 4.1, then $p = q+1$ and $(1, q)$ is mixed, which imply $p_{(1,q),(1,q)}^{(1,q-1)} \neq 0$ and $k_{1,q} = 2$ from Theorem 3.4 (ii) and Lemma 2.1 (i).

Case 1. $(1, q) \notin \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)$.

Note that $\{r \mid (1, r-1) \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)\} = \{2, h, q\}$. By Lemma 4.7 (i) and Lemma 4.2, $h = 3$ and $(1, 2)$ is mixed, which imply $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(1,1)} = 1$ from Theorem 3.4 (ii). In view of Proposition 4.9, Γ is isomorphic to one of the digraphs in Theorem 1.1 (iv) for $i = 0$.

Case 2. $(1, q) \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)$.

For fixed $x \in V\Gamma$, by Proposition 4.9, there exists an isomorphism τ from $\text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_q \times \mathbb{Z}_4, \{(1,0), (0,1), (1,2)\})$ to $\Delta_{q,h}(x)$. Write $\tau(a, b) = (a, b, 0)$ for each (a, b) . Suppose that there exists $(c, d, 0)$ such that $\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma((0,0,0), (c, d, 0)) = (1, q)$. Since $(1, q-1)$ is pure, by Lemma 2.2, we get $d \in \{1, 3\}$ and $c \neq 0$. Observe that $((0,0,0), (c, d, 0), (c+1, 3, 0), (c+2, 3, 0), \dots, (0, 3, 0))$ is a circuit of length $q - \hat{c} + 2$ containing arcs of types $(1, q)$ and $(1, h-1)$, contrary to Lemma 3.3 (ii) and Theorem 3.4 (ii). Hence, $\Gamma_{1,q} \notin \langle \{\Gamma_{1,q-1}, \Gamma_{1,h-1}\} \rangle$.

By Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.6 (ii), we have $A_{1,q}^2 = 2A_{1,q-1}$, which implies that $V\Delta_{q,q+1,h}$ has a partition $F_{q,h}(x) \dot{\cup} F_{q,h}(x')$. Let σ be an isomorphism from $\Delta_{q,h}(x)$ to $\Delta_{q,h}(x')$ such that $\sigma(0,0,0) \in \Gamma_{1,q}(0,0,0)$. Write $\sigma(a, b, 0) = (a, b, 1)$ for each (a, b) . Since $(0,0,1) \in P_{(1,q),(1,h-1)}((0,0,0), (0,1,1))$ and $k_{1,h-1} = 1$, we get $(0,1,1) \in \Gamma_{1,q}(0,1,0)$. Similarly, $(0,b,1) \in \Gamma_{1,q}(0,b,0)$ for each b . The fact that $A_{1,q}^2 = 2A_{1,q-1}$ implies that $(a, b, 1), (a, b+2, 1) \in \Gamma_{1,q}(a, b, 0)$ and $(a +$

$1, b, 0), (a + 1, b + 2, 0) \in \Gamma_{1,q}(a, b, 1)$ for each (a, b) . Thus, $\Delta_{q,q+1,h} \simeq \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_{2q} \times \mathbb{Z}_4, \{(2, 0), (2, 2), (1, 0), (1, 2), (0, 1)\})$.

Suppose $(1, 1) \notin \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)$. Note that $\{r \mid (1, r - 1) \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)\} = \{h, q, q + 1\}$. By Lemma 4.2 and Theorem 3.4 (ii), one has $h = 4$. Hence, Γ is isomorphic to one of the digraphs in Theorem 1.1 (vii) for $i = 1$. Suppose $(1, 1) \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)$. Note that $\{r \mid (1, r - 1) \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)\} = \{2, h, q, q + 1\}$. By Lemma 4.7 (i) and Lemma 4.2, $h = 3$ and $(1, 2)$ is mixed, which imply $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(1,1)} = 1$ from Theorem 3.4 (ii). Hence, Γ is isomorphic to one of the digraphs in Theorem 1.1 (vii) for $i = 0$. $\square$

In the remaining of this section, we prove Theorem 1.1 under the assumption that $C_{q,h}$ does not exist for any q and h . We divide it into two subsections according to separate assumptions, respectively.

7.1 Valency 4

In this subsection, we assume that the valency of Γ is 4.

For any nonempty subset F of R with $F = \langle F \rangle$, let

$$V\Gamma/F := \{F(x) \mid x \in V\Gamma\} \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma_i^F := \{(F(x), F(y)) \mid y \in F\Gamma_i F(x)\}.$$

The digraph $(V\Gamma/F, \cup_{(1,s) \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)} \Gamma_{1,s}^F)$ is said to be the *quotient digraph* of Γ over F , denoted by Γ/F .

Lemma 7.2 *If Γ has only two types of arcs, then Γ is isomorphic to one of the following digraphs:*

- (i) *The digraphs in Theorem 1.1 (i) and (iii).*
- (ii) *The digraphs in Theorem 1.1 (ii) and (iv) for $i = 1$.*

Proof. Let $k_{1,q-1} = k_{1,s-1} = 2$ with $q < s$. By Theorem 5.1, $q = 2$ and $(1, s - 1)$ is pure, or $(s, q) \in \mathcal{B}$. Suppose that $q = 2$ and $(1, s - 1)$ is pure. From Proposition 6.3 (ii), $\Gamma \simeq \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_s \times \mathbb{Z}_4, \{(0, 1), (1, 0), (1, 2), (0, 3)\})$ for $s \neq 4$. Suppose that $(s, q) \in \mathcal{B}$. Then $s = q + 1$ and $(1, q)$ is mixed. If $q > 2$, by Proposition 6.3 (i), then $\Gamma \simeq \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_{4q}, \{1, 2, 2q + 1, 2q + 2\})$. We consider $q = 2$ in the following.

By Theorem 3.4 (ii), $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(1,1)} \neq 0$. It follows from Lemma 2.3 that $\Gamma_{1,2} \notin \langle \Gamma_{1,1} \rangle$. Suppose $\tilde{\partial}(x_0, x_1) = (1, 2)$ for $x_0, x_1 \in V\Gamma$. Then $\partial(F_2(x_0), F_2(x_1)) = 1$ in $\Gamma/\langle \Gamma_{1,1} \rangle$. Since $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(1,1)} \neq 0$, we get $\Gamma_{1,1}(x_0) \cap \Gamma_{1,2}(x_1) \neq \emptyset$, which implies $\partial(F_2(x_1), F_2(x_0)) = 1$. Hence, $\Gamma/\langle \Gamma_{1,1} \rangle$ is a connected undirected graph. By $k_{1,2} = 2$, $\Gamma/\langle \Gamma_{1,1} \rangle \simeq C_l$.

Let $(F_2(x_0), F_2(x_1), \dots, F_2(x_{l-1}))$ be an undirected circuit. Suppose $l \neq 2$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $(x_0, x_1), (x_1, x_2), (x_3, x_2) \in \Gamma_{1,2}$. Then $x_1 \neq x_3$, $\tilde{\partial}(x_0, x_2) \neq (1, 1)$ and $|\Gamma_{1,2}^2| = 2$. Since $k_{1,1} = 2$, by Lemma 2.1 (i) and (v), we have $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(1,1)} = 1$, which implies $x_3 \in P_{(1,2),(1,2)}(x_0, x_2)$ from Lemma 2.2. Hence, $\partial(F_2(x_0), F_2(x_3)) = 1$ and $l = 4$. Thus, $l = 2$ or 4 .

Case 1. $\Gamma/\langle \Gamma_{1,1} \rangle \simeq C_2$.

Note that $V\Gamma = F_2(x_0) \dot{\cup} F_2(x_1)$. Let τ_i be an isomorphism from $\text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_n, \{1, n - 1\})$ to $\tilde{\Delta}_2(x_i)$. Write $\tau_i(a) = (a, i)$ for each a . Without loss of generality, we may assume $\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma((0, 0), (0, 1)) = (1, 2)$. By Lemma 2.1 (iii), we get $|\Gamma_{1,2}^2| = 1$ or 2 .

Case 1.1. $\Gamma_{1,2}^2 = \{\Gamma_{1,1}\}$.

By Lemma 2.1 (i), one has $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(1,1)} = 2$, which implies $(1, 0), (-1, 0) \in \Gamma_{1,2}(0, 1)$. It follows from Lemma 2.3 that $\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma((1, 0), (-1, 0)) = (2, 2)$. In view of Lemma 2.1 (vi), we get $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(1,1)} p_{(2,1),(1,1)}^{(1,2)} = 2 + p_{(2,1),(1,2)}^{(2,2)} = 4$. By Lemma 2.1 (i) and (v), we obtain $k_{2,2} = 1$. It follows from Lemma 2.3 that $n = 4$ and $|V\Gamma| = 8$. Since $\Gamma_{1,2}^2 = \{\Gamma_{1,1}\}$, by [3], we obtain $\Gamma \simeq \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_8, \{1, 2, 5, 6\})$.

Case 1.2. $|\Gamma_{1,2}^2| = 2$.

Assume that $((0, 1), (t, 0)) \in \Gamma_{1,2}$ and $((0, 0), (t, 0)) \notin \Gamma_{1,1}$. By Theorem 3.4 (iii) and Lemma 2.3, we have $\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma((0, 0), (t, 0)) = (2, 2)$. Hence, $n > 3$. Since $k_{1,1} = 2$, we get $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(1,1)} = 1$ from Lemma 2.1 (i) and (v). In view of Lemma 2.2, we obtain $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,2)} = 2$ and $k_{2,2} = 1$. By Lemma 2.3, one has $(2, 0), (-2, 0) \in \Gamma_{2,2}(0, 0)$, which implies $n = 4$ and $|V\Gamma| = 8$. Since $|\Gamma_{1,2}^2| = 2$, from [3], $\Gamma \simeq \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_8, \{1, 2, 3, 6\})$.

Case 2. $\Gamma/\langle\Gamma_{1,1}\rangle \simeq C_4$.

Note that $V\Gamma = F_2(x_0) \dot{\cup} F_2(x_1) \dot{\cup} F_2(x_2) \dot{\cup} F_2(x_3)$. Let σ_i be an isomorphism from $\text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_n, \{1, n-1\})$ to $\Delta_2(x_i)$ for each i . Write $\tau_i(a) = (a, i)$ for any a . Without loss of generality, we may assume $\partial_\Gamma((0, j), (0, j+1)) = (1, 2)$ for $j = 0, 1, 2$.

Since $(0, j+1) \in P_{(1,2),(1,1)}((0, j), (1, j+1))$, we have $(1, j)$ or $(-1, j) \in \Gamma_{1,2}(1, j+1)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma((1, j), (1, j+1)) = (1, 2)$. Since $(1, j+1) \in P_{(1,2),(1,1)}((1, j), (2, j+1))$ and $\Gamma/\langle\Gamma_{1,1}\rangle \simeq C_4$, one gets $\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma((2, j), (2, j+1)) = (1, 2)$. Similarly, $\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma((a, j), (a, j+1)) = (1, 2)$ for each $a \in \mathbb{Z}_n$ and $j \in \{0, 1, 2\}$.

By $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(1,1)} \neq 0$, we may assume $\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma((0, 1), (1, 0)) = (1, 2)$. Since $(1, 0) \in P_{(1,2),(1,1)}((0, 1), (2, 0))$, we get $(1, 1)$ or $(-1, 1) \in \Gamma_{2,1}(2, 0)$.

Case 2.1. $\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma((1, 1), (2, 0)) = (1, 2)$.

Since $(2, 0) \in P_{(1,2),(1,1)}((1, 1), (3, 0))$ and $\Gamma/\langle\Gamma_{1,1}\rangle \simeq C_4$, $\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma((2, 1), (3, 0)) = (1, 2)$. Similarly, $\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma((a, 1), (a+1, 0)) = (1, 2)$ for each $a \in \mathbb{Z}_n$. The fact that $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(1,1)} \neq 0$ and $\Gamma/\langle\Gamma_{1,1}\rangle \simeq C_4$ imply that $(0, 2) \in P_{(1,2),(1,2)}((0, 1), (-1, 1))$. Hence, $((0, 0), (0, 1), (0, 2), (-1, 1))$ is a circuit consisting of arcs of type $(1, 2)$. By Theorem 3.4 (iii), one gets $\partial_\Gamma((0, 0), (0, 2)) = (2, 2)$, which implies $\Gamma_{1,2}^2 = \{\Gamma_{1,1}, \Gamma_{2,2}\}$. If $k_{2,2} = 2$, by Lemma 2.1 (i) and (v), then $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(1,1)} = p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,2)} = 1$, contrary to Lemma 2.2; if $k_{2,2} = 1$, by Lemma 2.3, then $\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma((0, 0), (2, 0)) = (1, 1)$ and $n = 3$, which imply $\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma((0, 0), (1, 1)) = (2, 2)$, a contradiction.

Case 2.2. $\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma((-1, 1), (2, 0)) = (1, 2)$.

Since $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(1,1)} \neq 0$ and $((-1, 0), (-1, 2)) \notin \Gamma_{1,1}$, we have $\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma((-1, 0), (2, 0)) = (1, 1)$, $n = 4$ and $|V\Gamma| = 16$. By [3], $\Gamma \simeq \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_4 \times \mathbb{Z}_4, \{(0, 1), (1, 0), (2, 0), (0, 2)\})$. $\square$

Lemma 7.3 *If Γ has only three types of arcs, then Γ is isomorphic to one of the digraphs in Theorem 1.1 (v) and (viii).*

Proof. Let $k_{1,p-1} = 2$ and $k_{1,q-1} = k_{1,s-1} = 1$ with $q < s$.

Case 1. $(1, p-1)$ is pure.

By Theorem 5.1, we have $(p, q), (p, s)$ or $(q, s) \in \mathcal{B}$. In view of Theorem 3.4 (ii) and Lemma 2.1 (i), one gets $p = 2$ and $(q, s) \in \mathcal{B}$, which imply that $s = q + 1$ and

$(1, q)$ is mixed. Hence, $p_{(1,q),(1,q)}^{(1,q-1)} = 1$ and $(1, q-1)$ is pure. It follows from Proposition 6.4 that $V\Gamma$ has a partition $F_{2,q}(x_0) \dot{\cup} F_{2,q}(x_1)$ and there exists an isomorphism τ from $\text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_q \times \mathbb{Z}_n, \{(1,0), (0,1), (0,-1)\})$ to $\Delta_{2,q}(x_0)$ for $n \leq q - (1 + (-1)^q)/2$. Write $\tau(a, b) = (a, b, 0)$ for each (a, b) . Since $k_{1,q} = 1$, $\sigma : F_{2,q}(x_0) \rightarrow F_{2,q}(x_1)$, $x \mapsto x'$ is an isomorphism from $\Delta_{2,q}(x_0)$ to $\Delta_{2,q}(x_1)$, where $x' \in \Gamma_{1,q}(x)$. Write $\sigma(a, b, 0) = (a, b, 1)$ for each (a, b) . The fact that $p_{(1,q),(1,q)}^{(1,q-1)} = 1$ implies $\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma((a, b, 1), (a+1, b, 0)) = (1, q)$. Thus, Γ is isomorphic to one of the digraphs in Theorem 1.1 (viii).

Case 2. $(1, p-1)$ is mixed.

By Theorem 5.1, we have $q = 2$ and $(p, s) \in \mathcal{B}$. Then $p = s + 1$. In view of Theorem 3.4 (ii), $p_{(1,s),(1,s)}^{(1,s-1)} \neq 0$ and $(1, s-1)$ is pure. Since $k_{1,s-1} = 1$, we have $\Gamma_{1,1} \notin \langle \Gamma_{1,s-1} \rangle$. Let φ be an isomorphism from $\text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_s, \{1\})$ to $\Delta_s(x_0)$ for fixed $x_0 \in V\Gamma$. Write $\varphi(a) = (a, 0, 0)$ for any $a \in \mathbb{Z}_s$. Since $k_{1,1} = 1$, $V\Delta_{2,s}(x_0)$ has a partition $F_s(x_0) \dot{\cup} F_s(x_1)$. Then $\sigma : F_s(x_0) \rightarrow F_s(x_1)$, $x \mapsto x'$ is an isomorphism from $\Delta_s(x_0)$ to $\Delta_s(x_1)$, where $x' \in \Gamma_{1,1}(x)$. Write $\sigma(a, 0, 0) = (a, 1, 0)$ for each a .

Suppose that there exists $(c, d, 0)$ such that $\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma((0, 0, 0), (c, d, 0)) = (1, s)$. The fact that $(1, s-1)$ is pure and $k_{1,s-1} = 1$ imply $d = 1$ and $c \neq 0$. Since $k_{1,1} = 1$, by Lemma 6.1 and Lemma 2.1 (v), we get $p_{(1,s),(s,1)}^{(1,1)} = 2$, which implies $(c, 1, 0) \in P_{(1,s),(s,1)}((0, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0))$. Then $((0, 1, 0), (c, 1, 0), (c+1, 1, 0), \dots, (-1, 1, 0))$ is a circuit of length $s - \hat{c} + 1$, a contradiction. Hence, $\Gamma_{1,s} \notin \langle \{\Gamma_{1,1}, \Gamma_{1,s-1}\} \rangle$.

Since $k_{1,s-1} = 1$, by Lemma 2.1 (v), we have $p_{(1,s),(1,s)}^{(1,s-1)} = 2$, which implies that $V\Gamma$ has a partition $F_{2,s}(x_0) \dot{\cup} F_{2,s}(x'_0)$. Let ψ be an isomorphism from $\Delta_{2,s}(x_0)$ to $\Delta_{2,s}(x'_0)$ such that $\psi(0, 0, 0) \in \Gamma_{1,s}(0, 0, 0)$. Write $\psi(a, b, 0) = (a, b, 1)$ for each $a \in \mathbb{Z}_s$ and $b \in \{0, 1\}$. Since $p_{(1,s),(1,s)}^{(1,s-1)} = p_{(1,s),(s,1)}^{(1,1)} = 2$, we obtain $(a, 0, 1), (a, 1, 1) \in \Gamma_{1,s}(a, b, 0)$ and $(a+1, 0, 0), (a+1, 1, 0) \in \Gamma_{1,s}(a, b, 1)$. Then $\Gamma \simeq \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_{2s} \times \mathbb{Z}_2, \{(0, 1), (2, 0), (1, 0), (1, 1)\})$. $\square$

7.2 Valency more than 4

In this subsection, we assume that the valency of Γ is more than 4. By Theorem 5.1, $\{r \mid (1, r-1) \in \partial(\Gamma)\} = \{2, q, q+1\}$ and $(1, q)$ is mixed. It follows from Theorem 3.4 (ii) and Lemma 2.1 (i) that $(1, q-1)$ is pure and $k_{1,q} = 2$.

Lemma 7.4 *If $k_{1,q-1} = 2$, then Γ is isomorphic to one of the following digraphs:*

- (i) *The digraphs in Theorem 1.1 (ii) for $i = 0$.*
- (ii) *The digraphs in Theorem 1.1 (vi).*

Proof. If $\Gamma_{1,1} \in \Gamma_{1,q-1}\Gamma_{q-1,1}$, by Proposition 6.3 (i), then $\Gamma \simeq \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_{4q}, \{1, 2, 2q, 2q+1, 2q+2\})$ for $q \geq 3$. In the following, we consider the case that $\Gamma_{1,1} \notin \Gamma_{1,q-1}\Gamma_{q-1,1}$.

By Proposition 6.3 (i), there exists an isomorphism τ from $\text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_{4q}, \{1, 2, 2q+1, 2q+2\})$ to $\Delta_{q,q+1}(x)$ for fixed $x \in V\Gamma$. Write $\tau(a) = (a, 0)$ for each $a \in \mathbb{Z}_{4q}$. Observe that $\partial_\Gamma((0, 0), (b, 0)) + \partial_\Gamma((b, 0), (0, 0)) = q + (1 + (-1)^{\hat{b}+1})/2$ for $b \notin \{0, 2q\}$. Since $\Gamma_{1,1} \notin \Gamma_{1,q-1}\Gamma_{q-1,1}$, we have $\Gamma_{1,1} \notin \langle \{\Gamma_{1,q-1}, \Gamma_{1,q}\} \rangle$.

Case 1. $k_{1,1} = 1$.

Observe that $V\Gamma$ has a partition $F_{q,q+1}(x) \dot{\cup} F_{q,q+1}(x')$. Note that $\sigma : F_{q,q+1}(x) \rightarrow F_{q,q+1}(x')$, $y \mapsto y'$ is an isomorphism from $\Delta_{q,q+1}(x)$ to $\Delta_{q,q+1}(x')$, where $y' \in \Gamma_{1,1}(y)$. Write $\sigma(a, 0) = (a, 1)$ for each a . If $q = 3$, then $(6, 0), (3, 1), (9, 1) \in \Gamma_{3,3}(0, 0)$, a contradiction. Hence, Γ is isomorphic to one of the digraphs in Theorem 1.1 (vi) for $i = 0$.

Case 2. $k_{1,1} = 2$.

By Lemma 4.6 (i) and (iv), one gets $A_{1,q-1}A_{1,1} = 2A_{2,q}$ and $A_{1,q}A_{1,1} = 2A_{2,q+1}$. Hence, $V\Gamma$ has a partition $F_{q,q+1}(x) \dot{\cup} F_{q,q+1}(x')$. Let φ be an isomorphism from $\Delta_{q,q+1}(x)$ to $\Delta_{q,q+1}(x')$ such that $\varphi(0, 0) \in \Gamma_{1,1}(0, 0)$. Write $\varphi(a, 0) = (a, 1)$ for each a . Since $A_{1,q-1}A_{1,1} = 2A_{2,q}$ and $A_{1,q}A_{1,1} = 2A_{2,q+1}$, we have $(a, 1), (a + 2q, 1) \in \Gamma_{1,1}(a, 0)$ for each a . If $2 < q < 5$, then $(2q, 0), (q, 0), (3q, 0) \in \Gamma_{2,2}(0, 0)$, a contradiction. Therefore, Γ is isomorphic to one of the digraphs in Theorem 1.1 (vi) for $i = 1$. $\square$

Lemma 7.5 *If $k_{1,q-1} = 1$, then Γ is isomorphic to one of the digraphs in Theorem 1.1 (ix) and (x).*

Proof. Note that $k_{1,1} = 2$. Since $(1, q)$ is mixed, by Theorem 3.4 (ii) and Lemma 2.1 (v), $(1, q - 1)$ is pure and $p_{(1,q),(1,q)}^{(1,q-1)} = 2$. It follows from Proposition 6.4 that $V\Gamma$ has a partition $F_{2,q}(x_0) \dot{\cup} F_{2,q}(x_1)$ and there exists an isomorphism τ_i from $\text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_q \times \mathbb{Z}_n, \{(1, 0), (0, 1), (0, -1)\})$ to $\Delta_{2,q}(x_i)$ for $i = 0, 1$, where $n \leq q - (1 + (-1)^q)/2$. Write $\tau_i(a, b) = (a, b, i)$ for each $(a, b) \in \mathbb{Z}_q \times \mathbb{Z}_n$.

By Lemma 6.1, we have $p_{(1,q),(q,1)}^{(1,1)} \neq 0$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $(0, 0, 1), (0, -1, 1) \in \Gamma_{1,q}(0, 0, 0)$. In view of $(0, -1, 1) \in P_{(1,q),(1,1)}((0, 0, 0), (0, 0, 1))$, we may assume $(0, 0, 1) \in \Gamma_{1,q}(0, 1, 0)$. Since $(0, 0, 0) \notin P_{(q,1),(1,q)}((0, 0, 1), (0, 1, 1))$ and $p_{(1,q),(q,1)}^{(1,1)} \neq 0$, we get $((0, 1, 0), (0, 1, 1)) \in \Gamma_{1,q}$. Similarly, $(0, b, 1), (0, b - 1, 1) \in \Gamma_{1,q}(0, b, 0)$ for each b . In view of $p_{(1,q),(1,q)}^{(1,q-1)} = 2$, we obtain $(a, b, 1), (a, b - 1, 1) \in \Gamma_{1,q}(a, b, 0)$ and $(a + 1, b, 0), (a + 1, b + 1, 0) \in \Gamma_{1,q}(a, b, 1)$ for any $(a, b) \in \mathbb{Z}_q \times \mathbb{Z}_n$.

Suppose that $c = n/\gcd(q, n)$ and c is odd. Let φ be the mapping from Γ to the corresponding digraph in Theorem 1.1 (ix) satisfying $\varphi(a, b, i) = (2\hat{a} + i, (2\hat{a}c + ic + i)/2 + \hat{b})$. Routinely, φ is an isomorphism.

Suppose that $t = q/\gcd(q, n)$ and t is odd. Let ψ be the mapping from Γ to the corresponding digraph in Theorem 1.1 (x) such that $\psi(a, b, i) = (2\hat{b} + i, \hat{a} + \hat{b}t + i(1 + t)/2)$. Note that ψ is well defined. Assume that $\psi(a, b, i) = \psi(x, y, j)$ for some (a, b, i) and (x, y, j) . Since $2\hat{b} + i \equiv 2\hat{y} + j \pmod{2n}$, we have $i = j$ and $b = y$. By $\hat{a} + \hat{b}t + i(1 + t)/2 \equiv \hat{x} + \hat{y}t + j(1 + t)/2 \pmod{q}$, one gets $a = x$. Therefore, ψ is a bijection. One can verify that $((x_1, y_1, i_1), (x_2, y_2, i_2))$ is an arc if and only if $(\psi(x_1, y_1, i_1), \psi(x_2, y_2, i_2))$ is an arc. Hence, ψ is an isomorphism. $\square$

Combining Lemmas 7.1–7.5, we complete the proof of Theorem 1.1.

8 Concluding remarks

In this paper, the proofs heavily rely on our assumption of the commutativity. We are wondering whether this assumption is redundant.

By Theorem 1.1, the valency of any commutative quasi-thin weakly distance-regular digraph is at most 6. We introduce a related problem. Let Γ be a commutative weakly distance-regular digraph with valency k and the maximum intersection number p . It may be interesting to show that k is bounded by a function of p .

Acknowledgement

This research is supported by NSFC (11271047, 11301270, 11371204, 11501036, 11671043), the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central University of China, Youth Scholar Program of Beijing Normal University and China Postdoctoral Science Foundation (2015M570958).

References

- [1] Z. Arad, E. Fisman and M. Muzychuk, Generalized table algebras, *Israel J. Math.*, 114 (1999) 29–60.
- [2] E. Bannai and T. Ito, *Algebraic Combinatorics I: Association Schemes*, Benjamin/Cummings, California, 1984.
- [3] A. Hanaki, Classification of weakly distance-regular digraphs with up to 21 vertices, <http://math.shinshu-u.ac.jp/~hanaki/as/data/wdrdg>.
- [4] M. Hirasaka, On quasi-thin association schemes with odd number of points, *J. Algebra* 240 (2001) 665–679.
- [5] M. Hirasaka and M. Muzychuk, On quasi-thin association schemes, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* 98 (2002) 17–32.
- [6] M. Muzychuk and I. Ponomarenko, On quasi-thin association schemes, *J. Algebra* 351 (2012) 467–489.
- [7] H. Suzuki, Thin weakly distance-regular digraphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 92 (2004) 69–83.
- [8] K. Wang and H. Suzuki, Weakly distance-regular digraphs, *Discrete Math.* 264 (2003) 225–236.
- [9] K. Wang, Commutative weakly distance-regular digraphs of girth 2, *European J. Combin.* 25 (2004) 363–375.
- [10] Y. Yang, B. Lv and K. Wang, Weakly distance-regular digraphs of valency three, I, *Electron. J. Combin.* 23(2) (2016), Paper 2.12.
- [11] Y. Yang, B. Lv and K. Wang, Weakly distance-regular digraphs of valency three, II, in preparation.
- [12] P.H. Zieschang, An Algebraic Approach to Association Schemes, in: *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, Vol. 1628, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1996.

Table 1 Two way distance of digraphs in Theorem 1.1

Γ	Conditions	$\tilde{\partial}((0, 0), (a, b))$ with $(a, b) \neq (0, 0)$
(iv)	$a \neq 0$	$(\beta(\hat{b}) + \hat{a}, q + \beta(\hat{b}) - \hat{a})$
	$a = 0$	$(\lceil \frac{\hat{b}}{2} \rceil + (-1)^{\hat{b}} \lceil \frac{\hat{b}-1}{2} \rceil i, \lceil 2 - \frac{\hat{b}}{2} \rceil + (-1)^{\hat{b}} \lceil \frac{3-\hat{b}}{2} \rceil i)$
(v)	$2 \nmid \hat{a}$	$(\frac{\hat{a}+1}{2}, q - \frac{\hat{a}-1}{2})$
	$(a, b) \neq (0, 1)$ and $2 \mid \hat{a}$	$(\hat{b} + \frac{\hat{a}}{2}, q + \hat{b} - \frac{\hat{a}}{2})$
	$(a, b) = (0, 1)$	$(1, 1)$
(vi)	$0 < \hat{a} < 2q$	$(\frac{\hat{a}+2\hat{b}+\beta(\hat{a})}{2}, q - \frac{\hat{a}-2\hat{b}-\beta(\hat{a})}{2})$
	$\hat{a} > 2q$	$(\frac{\hat{a}+2\hat{b}+\beta(\hat{a})}{2} - q, 2q - \frac{\hat{a}-2\hat{b}-\beta(\hat{a})}{2})$
	$a = 2q$	$(q^{1-i} + \hat{b} + (-1)^{\hat{b}} i, q^{1-i} + \hat{b} + (-1)^{\hat{b}} i)$
	$(a, b) = (0, 1)$	$(1, 1)$
(vii)	$a \neq 0$	$(\beta(\hat{b}) + \frac{\hat{a}+\beta(\hat{a})}{2}, q + \beta(\hat{b}) - \frac{\hat{a}-\beta(\hat{a})}{2})$
	$a = 0$	$(\lceil \frac{\hat{b}}{2} \rceil + \lceil \frac{\hat{b}-1}{2} \rceil i, \lceil 2 - \frac{\hat{b}}{2} \rceil + \lceil \frac{3-\hat{b}}{2} \rceil i)$
(viii)	$a = 0$ and $\hat{b} \leq \frac{n}{2}$	$(\hat{b}, \hat{b})$
	$a = 0$ and $\hat{b} > \frac{n}{2}$	$(n - \hat{b}, n - \hat{b})$
	$a \neq 0$ and $\hat{b} \leq \frac{n}{2}$	$(\hat{b} + \frac{\hat{a}+\beta(\hat{a})}{2}, \hat{b} + q - \frac{\hat{a}-\beta(\hat{a})}{2})$
	$a \neq 0$ and $\hat{b} > \frac{n}{2}$	$(n - \hat{b} + \frac{\hat{a}+\beta(\hat{a})}{2}, n - \hat{b} + q - \frac{\hat{a}-\beta(\hat{a})}{2})$
(ix)	$a = 0$ and $v_{a,b} \leq \frac{n}{2}$	$(v_{a,b}, v_{a,b})$
	$a = 0$ and $v_{a,b} > \frac{n}{2}$	$(n - v_{a,b}, n - v_{a,b})$
	$a \neq 0$ and $v_{a,b} \leq \frac{n-\beta(\hat{a})}{2}$	$(v_{a,b} + \frac{\hat{a}+\beta(\hat{a})}{2}, v_{a,b} + q - \frac{\hat{a}-\beta(\hat{a})}{2})$
	$a \neq 0$ and $v_{a,b} > \frac{n-\beta(\hat{a})}{2}$	$(n - v_{a,b} + \frac{\hat{a}-\beta(\hat{a})}{2}, n - v_{a,b} + q - \frac{\hat{a}+\beta(\hat{a})}{2})$
(x)	$u_{a,b} = 0$ and $v_a \leq \frac{n}{2}$	(v_a, v_a)
	$u_{a,b} = 0$ and $v_a > \frac{n}{2}$	$(n - v_a, n - v_a)$
	$u_{a,b} \neq 0$ and $v_a \leq \frac{n-\beta(u_{a,b})}{2}$	$(v_a + \frac{u_{a,b}+\beta(u_{a,b})}{2}, v_a + q - \frac{u_{a,b}-\beta(u_{a,b})}{2})$
	$u_{a,b} \neq 0$ and $v_a > \frac{n-\beta(u_{a,b})}{2}$	$(n - v_a + \frac{u_{a,b}-\beta(u_{a,b})}{2}, n - v_a + q - \frac{u_{a,b}+\beta(u_{a,b})}{2})$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \beta(q) &= (1 + (-1)^{q+1})/2, \quad v_a = (\hat{a} - \beta(\hat{a}))/2, \\
 0 \leq v_{a,b} < n \text{ and } v_{a,b} &\equiv \hat{b} - (\hat{a}c + \beta(\hat{a}))/2 \pmod{n}, \\
 0 \leq u_{a,b} < q \text{ and } u_{a,b} &\equiv 2\hat{b} - \beta(\hat{a})t - 2tv_a \pmod{q}.
 \end{aligned}$$